The Journal of Historical Review

This Issue:

Percy L. Greaves, Jr.
Three 'Day of Infamy' Assessments

Dr. Arthur R. Butz
The Faurisson Affair—II

Dr. James J. Martin
Charles A. Beard: A Tribute

Issah Nakhleh
Memorandum to the President

Thomas Henry Irwin
Thomas E. Watson Revisited

—plus—
Inside Story of the Hess Flight

Volume Three, Number Three *Fall 1982*

The Journal of Historical Review

EDITOR
THOMAS J. MARCELLUS

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
KEITH STIMELY

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DR. WALTER BEVERAGGI ALLENDE
UNIVERSITY OF BUENOS AIRES, Buenos Aires

DR. AUSTIN J. APP
LA SALLE COLLEGE, Philadelphia (Ret.)

DR. GEORGE ASHLEY
LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

JOHN BENNETT
VICTORIAN COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES
Melbourne, Australia

DR. REINHARD K. BUCHNER
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, Long Beach

DR. ARTHUR R. BUTZ
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, Evanston

DR. ROBERT FAURISSON
UNIVERSITY OF LYON-2, France

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine, Täby, Sweden

PERCY L. GREAVES JR.
Free Market Economist

SAMUEL E. KONKIN III
The New Libertarian, Long Beach

DR. MARTIN A. LARSON
The Spotlight, Washington, D.C.

DR. JAMES J. MARTIN
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

DR. REVILO P. OLIVER
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Urbana

DR. WILHELM STÄGLICH
Retired Judge, West Germany

UDO WALENDY
VERLAG FÜR VOLKSTUM & ZEITGESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

DR. CHARLES E. WEBER
Former Head, Department of Modern Languages
UNIVERSITY OF TULSA, Oklahoma

DR. ANDREAS R. WESSERLE
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY, Milwaukee (Ret.)

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription prices are as follows: One year, $30; two years, $50; three years, $70—or the equivalent in foreign currency. Foreign subscribers must add $5 if paying by remittance drawn on a foreign bank. For domestic first class delivery add $5 per year. For overseas air delivery add $12 per year. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates available on request. Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the editor, but must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
Encyclopedia of Associations
Writers Market 1982
PTLA Catalog
EBSCO Librarians Handbook

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, U.S.A.

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made prior to off-printing, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

"Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance; California 90505, United States of America. Subscription rate: $30 per year."

Two copies of each off-print should be submitted to the Editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

Contents

Correspondence 229

Charles A. Beard: A Tribute 239
Dr. James J. Martin

Memorandum to the President 259
Issah Nakhleh

The Inside Story of the Hess Flight 291
Mark Weber

Thomas E. Watson Revisited 301
Thomas Henry Irwin

Three Assessments of the Infamy of 7 December 1941 319
Percy L. Greaves, Jr.

The Faurisson Affair—II 341
Dr. Arthur R. Butz

About the Contributors 352

From the Editor

THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY last year of the Pearl Harbor disaster saw the publication within a short span of time of no less than three substantial books all claiming to shed *important* new light on the subject. Only one of them really did—John Toland's *Infamy*. Percy L. Greaves, Jr.—an authority who knows probably more than any other alive what really brought on the attack and subsequent cover-up of the facts—reviews in this issue the three books, lending his expertise to the resolution of a controversy in which revisionism has clearly emerged the winner.

It appears the "Faurisson Affair" is still not over, at least according to Arthur R. Butz. In this issue Dr. Butz reviews two relatively new French publications that appraise Professor Faurisson's past and possibly future trials from a refreshing perspective: in support for the man who dared announce publicly that "The alleged gassings and the alleged Jewish genocide are only one and the same historical lie . . . "

Next we have Dr. James J. Martin's amicable tribute to the most widely read and ultimately valuable revisionist historian this century has known: Charles Austin Beard.

Golda Meier once remarked in response to a direct question: "What Palestinians?" And others of her peculiar frame of mind still strive for total obfuscation despite the fact that many thousands *fewer* Palestinians are alive today than were three months ago. Issah Nakhleh, a long time Palestinian diplomat, gives us the advantage of his years of experience with Palestine, its indigenous peoples and the roots of the current holocaust being leveled against them.

The name of the late Senator from Georgia, Tom Watson, has been sullied by just about every scrap of slanderous garbage the ubiquitous "Anti"-Defamation League has been able to sling since his death in 1922. Thus "The Sage of Hickory Hill" has become immensely interesting. Thomas Henry Irwin has spent years studying the Watson phenomenon, and here reveals some of the essence of a man whose political and cultural designs consistently included two of the more elusive qualities of popular statecraft: Honesty and Wisdom.

A now almost forgotten article appeared in a 1943 issue of *The American Mercury* which shed considerable light on the historic Rudolf Hess peace flight. Mark Weber re-introduces that article here, pointing out a few salient features which perhaps earmarked it as unfit for public consumption once the post-war historical blackout was ordained and fully operative.

Finally, please join us in welcoming a new member to our Editorial Advisory Committee: George Ashley. Dr. Ashley, a history instructor in the Los Angeles public schools, reaped a whirlwind of local Zionist abuse last May when he answered a student's query by stating his conviction that "Accounts of Jewish deaths during the Holocaust are greatly exaggerated."

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Correspondence

THE HOLOCAUST AND ITS RELIGIOUS ROOTS

It was good to read Dr. Charles Weber's article "The Six Million Thesis—*Cui Bono*?" in the Summer 1982 issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*. Dr. Weber's article does well to point out some of the concrete, practical reasons for the propagation and perpetuation of the holocaust myth. Among these is the financial motive, the billions bilked from West Germany as "reparations," the billions raised from world Jewry as sympathy money, as a "moral obligation." Dr. Weber may be right in his contention that East-block countries join in perpetuating the myth because they wish to remind their oppressed populations that things might have been worse if the Nazis had won. I believe, however, that from the perspective of, and in the jargon of, the "socialist" countries, the West, i.e., the old Western Allies, now represent the "evils" of Fascism-Nazism. In the light of the long and deep-rooted anti-Semitic traditions of many Eastern European peoples, e.g. the Poles, the Russians, etc., it is unlikely that those peoples identify with the Jews. During World War II, German military authorities often had to intervene to protect Jews from the local population. It seems more plausible that East-block propaganda efforts are less geared toward building sympathy for the Jews as such, than to illustrating to what monstrous depths capitalist-Fascist-Nazism can descend, a "Nazi" imperialism which still threatens their countries.

Besides these tangible, concrete reasons, holocaustism and its ceaseless propagation also have religious roots. War, pestilence, famine, and death as personified in the Grim Reaper appealed to the Medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque imagination. A common theme in music, painting, and literature was the Dance of Death, or *Totentanz*. Of course the sick fantasies of Jewish writers (and they are numerous, if not dominant) are engaged in elaborating new and more sensational aspects of holocaustism. Because such a steady diet of it has been prepared over the years, and because this death-diet continues to be served up relentlessly, it is not surprising that some non-Jewish imaginations have taken up holocaustism, which is essentially a nauseating, Jewish-directed updating and restaging of the old Dance of Death theme. Some non-Jewish authors have found it engaging or profitible to join in the Jewish-led Dance of Death. The real cost of the holocaust is the psychic damage inflicted on humanity, including the Jews themselves, by the sick fantasies of those who get their kicks from perpetuating the six million myth. Many Jews resent their holocaust, for them the holocaust, being upstaged by talk of Hiroshima or any impending nuclear holocaust (perhaps one that might result from that continuing struggle as to who shall own that "Holy" Land).

One consolation for the thoughtful non-Jew when exposed to the constant flood of pathological holocaust Dance of Death fantasies, including those dressed up as "semi-documentaries," is to remember that the Hindu deity Shiva, known as Lord of the Dance, cyclically swings back and forth between creation and destruction, between life and death. Right now the Jews are calling the cacophonous tune, giving the negative beat to a contemporary Dance of Death. But sooner than the Jews know it, the cyclic pendulum may swing back to a healthier, more positive and life-oriented attitude. Instead of peddling psychoses and sickness, writers and the media may again take up more invigorating, life-directed themes. Perhaps because harsh post-war economic realities did not permit it, perhaps because the media were supervised and censored by the Allies (and the Jews), Germans had neither the leisure nor the luxury of indulging in *their own* Dance of Death around the staggering destruction and appalling loss of life caused by the Allied armies and aerial bombardments. Instead the Germans picked up the pieces of a destruction which was very real and tangible, not faked and phony, and got on with the business of life. Other peoples would do well to emulate that example.

Another factor in the perpetuation of holocaustism is the profound religious and psychological need of Jews and Judaism to perpetuate their persecutions. Such tales are integrally woven into the texture and fabric of Jewish scripture and ritual. Any cursory (or lengthy) reading of the Old Testament will reveal that it is a record of the Jewish tribal God, Jehovah, constantly smiting and striking down the enemies of his chosen people.

In large measure, the Jewish religion is simply a record of the triumph of the children of Israel over their enemies. Triumphs, such as the one commemorated in the Feast of Passover, were achieved with the help of their tribal god. Egyptians visited by unspeakable plagues and afflictions, Haman in Persia hung on the gallows he destined for the Jews—the message is always the same. Millions of Germans grovelling in the ruins, and millions of Germans and others displaced and uprooted at the end of World War II are, to the Jews, merely modern counterparts of the Egyptians of old. Although it sometimes serves the Jewish imagination to resurrect Hitler in the Jungles of South America, in the Sahara, the Antarctic, or even in outer space, Hitler—dead in his gutted bunker—is, for the Jew, merely a modern Haman, another anti-Semite who tried to destroy the Jews but was himself destroyed. On the feast of Purim, Jews make a great din in the synagogue, loudly rattling and shouting when Haman's name is mentioned. They call it "making a *megillah*." Continuing holocaustism, in all its forms, (the written and spoken word, museums, monuments, study programs, etc.) may be said to be diverse forms and degrees of "*making a megillah*," with Hitler substituted for Haman. The Wailing Wall mentality, i.e. the necessity to lament loudly, publicly, stridently, is part of the essence of Judaism. Wailing about persecution and the subsequent brazen revelling in the triumph over it, are basic Jewish characteristics. Before the alleged "holocaust," the Jews were an international entity. They have since retained this identity and added a national identity the state called "Israel," a state which does much public holocaust wailing, and also exults openly in its repeated military tri-

umphs, despite the hostility of much of the world, as expressed in numerous U.N. resolutions which Israel ignores.

For the Jews, their solidarity and superiority are sealed and confirmed by triumph over enemies. This persecution, and the triumph over it, is essential to Jewish identity. Jewish leaders make no attempt to conceal their fear of assimilation. Ben-Gurion, and many rabbis, have pointed out that the great enemy of Judaism in America is not the pogrom, but the country club, i.e. the social acceptance and possible absorption of the Jews by their host population. Although Christianity, like Islam, may correctly be said to be a sect of Judaism, and Catholicism and Protestantism may be said to be sub-sects of that sect, most professional Jews are terrified of intermarriage with Gentiles. Even though neither the Jewish nor the Gentile partner may practice any religion in earnest, it is usually the Gentile partner who converts to Judaism, because the Jewish neurosis insists on preserving its existence as a chosen, elite group, surrounded by a horde of less favored individuals, to whom Jews are superior in every respect but numbers. To cement Jewish religious and ethnic identity, persecution and the triumph over it are essential. Therefore, many Jews today point out the necessity to kill 10, 20, or even 100 hostile, persecuting Arabs for every Jew killed.

This institutionalizing and ritualizing of persecution and triumph over it has, of course, been extended to the 20th century "holocaust." In synagogue vestibules today one is greeted by a *Yad Vashem* memorial, a kind of elaborate candelabrum commemorating the 6 million. It is the first and last thing a Jew sees when entering or leaving the synagogue. This contraption, this candelabrum, is of course a contemporary fabrication. But it has become as much an emblem of Judaism as the menorah, the symbolic candelabrum emblematic of the Hanukah holiday, which Jews style "The Feast of Lights." It might more appropriately be called the "Feast of Darkness," since it commemorates Jehovah's miraculous intervention on behalf of his people against Hellenist Greeks, to enable the Jews to retain their identity, their religion, i.e. the racial and religious psychosis called Judaism. It would truly have been a Feast of Lights if those Hellenist Greeks had won. Had they, the light of classical Greek civilization might not have been extinguished for so many centuries by the Jewish infection which spread to non-Jews, producing the Christian outgrowth still with us today.

Even Communist rulers have learned that the religious impulse in man is ineradicable, however brilliant the light of reason brought to bear on it. One of the more noble endeavors of Nazi Germany was the attempt to provide Germans with a workable religious alternative to that form of Judaism known as Christianity. Celtic, Germanic, Romanic, Slavic, and other peoples who abandoned their own religious identity for Christianity would do well to turn again to the more nature-oriented religion of their ancestors. Unfortunately, their own religious traditions were disturbed, interrupted, vitiated, diluted, destroyed or partially absorbed by Christianity. Just as the "sacrifice of the Mass" may be said to be an improvement on the animal and human sacrifices which preceeded it, the still living but much vitiated traditions of pre-Christianity should be taken up again, refined, ennobled, elaborated, and developed. Many of the world's illusions and ills might thus be alleviated. Even that so-called

"Holy" Land might become truly holy, if Judaism and its two daughters, Christianity and Islam, were given up in favor of older, pantheistic religions which existed in the area before the naissance of that unholy trio of related religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. In Ireland, Celts often still join battle in the name of two sub-sects of a sect of Judaism. One solution for Ireland's problems would be to abandon both the Catholic and Protestant form of Jewish-derived Christianity and to return to a restructured, re-created form of earliest Celtic religions.

In Europe, Christianity moved into the power vacuum created by the collapse of the Roman Empire. Diocesan boundaries followed exactly the prior Roman administrative lines. Subsequently, many non-Christian or "pagan" peoples, such as the Saxons, were forcibly converted. Other tribes left for Iceland to escape forced Christianization, although they, too, were eventually converted. The best minds of Europe, however, minds like Goethe's and Victor Hugo's, freed themselves from the shackles of Christianity, while retaining a profoundly religious attitude (an amalgam of their own making) towards life. Religious expression, especially when organized, has often been irrational. Yet the religious spirit innate in man need not conflict with scientific inquiry. In fact, the scientific investigation along with the artistic creation, *is* religion, real religion. Perhaps the reason Christianity today needs a Bernstein to write its music and a Chagall to do its artwork is because it is an alien, assumed religion for many peoples who have lost their own indigenous religion.

Holocaustism, like Christianity and Islam, is a product of Judaism. When more people realize this, there will be hope for liberation from holocaustism and other religion-related evils.

George F. Corners II
New York City

BOOK COLLECTORS

Friends here in Milwaukee have been attempting to buy old reference books on the used market, the purpose being that they wish to help found a school library (private) in Necedah, Wisconsin.

As they go about from used bookstore to used bookstore, they find encyclopedia sets older than the 1960s with entire volumes missing: each time the same volumes—those dealing with the subject of Jews or Khazars. At these same bookstores they say that one cannot find an almanac old enough to deal with the Jewish population figures which might help shed light on the "Holocaust" allegation.

When they answer an advertisement in the local papers for used books of a historical or informational nature, they find that two or three young persons have already contacted the seller, and have literally made an offer which the seller was not able to refuse.

A month or so ago, on a local radio talk show, I made an argument against the "Holocaust" allegations using the figures from the 1938 *World Almanac* and the February 22, 1948 edition of the *New York Times*, among other materials. These friends of ours told me that the Zionists were out the very next day trying to sweep up any old editions of the *World Almanac* still about in the used bookstores.

Donald V. Clerkin
Milwaukee, Wis.

The Question of the Deaths of Rumanian Jews

An Exchange of Correspondence Between Mark Weber and Dr. Serban Andronescu

Dear Dr. Andronescu, 8 May 1982

I am very grateful for your letter of 15 January 1982. Please pardon this tardy reply.

As you suggested, I found the journal *Genus* in the Library of Congress which contained the report by Dr. Sabin Manuila and Dr. W. Filderman, "Regional development of the Jewish population in Romania." (*Genus* [Rome] Vol. XIII, Nos. 1-4 1957. pp. 153-165. LC# HB 881 .G4 1957.) I put off writing to you until I had obtained a copy of the article and had a chance to study it carefully.

During your presentation at the 1981 Institute for Historical Review Conference (published in *The JHR*, Summer 1982), you stated that the Manuila/Filderman report gave a figure of only 15,000 as the total number of Rumanian Jews who perished during the Second World War. This figure is actually only of Jews in the truncated Rumanian state and does not include the Jews of northern Transylvania (which was ceded to Hungary 1940-1945) or of the territory ceded 1940-1941 to the USSR (including Bessarabia). According to Manuila/Filderman, the total "decrease in the number of Jews" includes not only the 15,000 you mentioned, but 90,295 for northern Transylvania and 103,919 for the Soviet territories (including Bessarabia). The total number of Jewish losses for Rumania in its pre-1940 borders, according to Manuila/Filderman, is 209,214.

It is *this* figure, and not that of 15,000, which must be compared with the figures of Jewish "holocaust" victims for Rumania which are claimed by Jewish historians today.

In 1946, the American Jewish Congress estimated the number of Jewish victims for Rumania (pre-1940 borders) at 425,000. That same year, the Angol-American Committee of Inquiry Regarding the Problems of European Jewry and Palestine gave an estimate of 530,000, likewise for the pre-1940 border Rumania. Gerald Rietlinger in *The Final Solution* gives an estimate of 200,000 to 220,000 Jewish victims. Raul Hilberg in *The Destruction of the European Jews* estimates 270,000. In her book *The War Against the Jews*, Lucy Dawidowicz estimates 300,000. Of these various widely circulated "establishment" estimates, Reitlinger's is closest to that of Manuila/Filderman.

But this kind of comparison can be very misleading because several very important qualifications must be made to the figure of 209,214 given by Manuila/Filderman. This estimate is only for "decrease in the number of Jews" and includes not only Jews who were killed, but also those who simply died and, more importantly, those who emigrated or simply remained "missing." Although Manuila/Filderman do not discuss it, "missing" Jews would most likely also include those who hastily had

themselves baptized in order to avoid classification as Jews. (This was possible under Rumanian policy.) Hilberg (p.494) quotes a reliable German newspaper which reported in 1942 that 40,000 Jews in Bessarabia (one in every five) had "converted" to avoid deportation to Transnistria. More significantly, Filderman reports that no less than 100,000 Jews in the temporarily-Soviet territories (including Bessarabia) were evacuated or withdrew into the interior of the Soviet Union before the area was retaken by Rumanian-German forces in 1941. *Manuila/Filderman report that 100,000 among their 209,214 estimate of "decrease in the number of Jews."* Taking that into account, this reduces the number of Rumanian Jews who were killed or died to a maximum of 109,214.

But even this figure is too high. Manuila/Filderman claim that of an estimated 148,295 Jews who were living in northern Transylvania, 137,125 were "deported to Germany, to forced labor camps, with the exception of 14,000. There returned to Rumania a total of 44,000, which were found in various camps there (*sic*) at the end of the war. Hence there were altogether 58,000 survivors, and the rest of 90,295 "perished." At another point, though, Manuila/Filderman admit that the figure of 90,295 is really for "decrease by deaths and migration." That is, it includes Jews from northern Transylvania who survived the war and emigrated to Palestine, the United States, western Europe and so forth.

Even if we were to accept a rather high figure of approximately 100,000 as the maximum number of Rumanian Jews who perished, based on the Manuila/Filderman estimates, we still do not know how many of that number died unavoidably due to wartime conditions and how many were killed for whatever reasons.

Although certainly more reliable than most estimates of this kind, I believe that the Manuila/Filderman figures exagerrate Rumanian Jewish losses and must still be viewed with caution. For example, I believe that their estimate of 137,125 for the number of Jews deported from northern Transylvania to the German Reich is probably too high.

The important point, though, is that the Manuila/Filderman report proves that *all* of the standard estimates for the number of Rumanian Jewish "holocaust victims" are grossly irresponsible exagerrations. Even if we were to accept a figure of 100,000 deaths, which would be high according to the Manuila/Filderman report, this would still be anywhere from one-half to less than one-fifth of the number claimed by establishment Jewish historians.

I was impressed with the lengthy article you wrote for the publication "Romanian Communion." Thank you for sending it. As you point out, it is important to remember that what Lucy Dawidowicz calls "The War Against the Jews" ultimately ended in a victory for the self-chosen people.

It so happens that a former university colleague of mine now words for Radio Free Europe in Munich. He also commented on the important role played by the Jews at RFE.

I certainly look forward to meeting and talking with you again. There are a number of topics I'd like to discuss.

Best regards,
Mark Weber
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Weber: 15 May 1982

I have your letter of 8 May and am very surprised by what you write about the "Romanian" Jews. You are an important contributor to revisionist publications and it is important that you have an accurate view of what you call "Romanian" Jewry. I support revisionist activities too, and receive some of the publications. However, if I noticed in one of these publications such a view as that expressed in your letter, I would protest that view.

We—academic researchers—must differentiate between the *Romanian* administration over *Romanian* territories and the alien administration (Soviet, Hungarian, Bulgarian) over the same territories. I am referring here to the northern half of Transylvania, to Bessarabia and to the southern part of Dobrudja, all territories which were (and, in part, still are) under an alien administration. What you call "Romanian" Jewry became Hungarian Jewry, Soviet Jewry and Bulgarian Jewry as soon as these territories became Hungarian, Soviet, or Bulgarian in 1940. You should know that the Jews usually change their residence from one country to another. Their only true allegience is to Israel.

Moreover, under no circumstances can you honestly make the Romanian administration responsible for what happened to the Jews who remained in those ceded territories. To make myself clear, here is an example. Take a Jew who was born in Oradea in 1920, under Romanian administration. He became a "Hungarian" Jew between 1940 and 1945 when Oradea was under Hungarian rule. Then he emigrated to France. If something happened to him in France, would you make the Hungarian or Romanian administrations responsible for what happened to him under the French rule? Of course not. This is a principle of International law and not of one's opinion. According to the same legal principle, if he committed a crime in France and then he fled to Hungary or Romania he cannot be punished for that crime by the Hungarian or Romanian laws: he must be extradited to France. You cannot even list him as a Romanian Jew because there is no law in Romania(as there is in the USA) to grant somebody Romanian citizenship on the basis of his birth only.

For your complete information I will tell you a true story. There lived in Oradea (a city of Transylvania) a very rich Jewish hotel-keeper who, like the majority of Jews, remained in Oradea after 1940. When the Hungarian regent, Admiral Horthy, triumphantly entered Oradea and took possession of that territory, the hotel-keeper decorated at his own expense the large avenue of the city, on which the admiral pompously paraded riding a beautiful silvery mare. Four years later, in June 1944, when the Hungarian police booked him for deportation, he vainly protested, invoking his loyalty to Hungary; he was taken from Oradea together with other Jews and never came back.

The Romanian administration of Bucharest was unable to care for those who remained in those territories, whether Romanians, Jews, or others. As a matter of fact, more Romanians than Jews died in those territories because of various acts of war, but nobody speaks about

them today. We, with our Christian background, prefer to forget about such ugly things. Many more Romanians were deported from Bessarabia by the Soviets and many Russians and Udrainians were brought in instead so as to give the impression that Bessarabia was not Romania. The same thing happened to the German population of Poland, mainly to those Germans who lived in Pomerania, around Danzig, but again nobody speaks about them today.

Sincerely,
Dr. Serban Andronescu
New York City

Dear Dr. Andronescu, 24 May 1982

Thank you for your letter of 15 May.

I'm very sorry that I did not make myself more clear in my letter to you of 8 May. It seems that the main misunderstanding is due to my use of the term "Rumanian Jews" to refer to Jews from within the pre-1940 Rumanian borders. Like Manuila and Filderman, as well as most other historians, I write "Rumanian Jews" simply as a term of convenience.

You state that only Jews under Rumanian administration should be counted as "Rumanian Jews." I understand your point of view. However, it is not unreasonable (for purposes of statistical comparison) to count as "Rumanian Jews" all Jews in pre-1940 Rumania, in much the same way that Jews in West Prussia, Upper Silesia, and so forth, are almost always counted today as "Polish Jews" even though these territories were integral parts of the German Reich during the Second World War. Should the Jews who lived in Warsaw during the Second World War be counted today as "Polish Jews" or "German Jews," considering the fact that the Polish state had ceased to exist and Warsaw was in a territory legally regarded as a "Nebenland" of the German Reich? Should Jews living in the Sudetenland during the war be counted today as "Czechoslovakian Jews" or "German Jews"?

Just as it is not unreasonable to count Jews in Upper Silesia as "Polish Jews" because the territory was part of Poland before and after the war, so also is it not unreasonable to count Jews in northern Transylvania as "Rumanian Jews" because the territory was likewise part of Rumania before and after the war.

Contrary to what you imply in your letter of 15 May, at no point in my letter of 8 May did I ever "make the Romanian administration responsible for what happened to the Jews who remained in those ceded territories." Indeed, I made a careful distinction between "the truncated Rumanian state" and pre-1940 Rumania. I specifically pointed out that northern Transylvania, for example, was administered by Hungary between 1940 and 1945 during the time when many Jews from the area were deported to Germany. Obviously, neither the Rumanian government nor the Rumanian administration. Please realize that I am less concerned with attributing "responsibility" for Jewish losses than in determining *the extent* of Jewish deaths during the war in all of pre-1940 Rumania (including those territories not under Rumanian admin-

istration).

During your presentation at the IHR conference, you stated that the indeed reputable survey by Manuila and Filderman had estimated the number of "Jews who died in Rumania during the war" at only 15,000. When I first heard a tape recording of that statement, I was immediately rather suspicious. It was hard for me to believe that a reputable estimate could be *so much* lower than those we see today.

Actually, the Manuila/Filderman report estimated "Jewish losses" for the territory of 1939 Rumania at 209,214 of which two percent (15,000) are attributed to the Rumanian administration. The 15,000 figure which you cited cannot be compared with the estimates of Dawidiwicz and other Jewish historians because theirs are for Jews in a much larger geographical area. The comparisons of estimates you made at the IHR conference is almost completely meaningless because the estimates you compare are for quite different territories and groups of Jews.

Also contrary to what you stated, the various Jewish estimates of "Rumanian Jews" who died during the war are *not* Jews "killed by the Rumanians," but rather of Jews from the territory of pre-1940 Rumania who perished, at whoever's hands and in whatever circumstances.

You also stated that ". . . after the publication of this (Manuila/Filderman) paper . . . nobody spoke about that matter for almost twenty years, when suddenly . . . the figure (of 15,000) rose abruptly to what I would call stage two (250,000) . . ." Actually, the estimates ot Rumanian Jewish losses did *not* increase steadily following the publication of the Manuila/Filderman report in 1957. The highest estimate of Rumanian Jewish losses (pre-1940 borders) that I have seen is 530,000. This estimate was made by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry Regarding the Problems of European Jewry and Palestine in April 1946, that is, eleven years *before* the publication of the Manuila/Filderman report.

I believe that your unhappiness with my letter of 8 May is based on a misunderstanding. Please believe me when I stress that I completely share your concern for historical truth and objectivity. That's why I've gone to the effort of writing to you about this matter. We all have a responsibility to keep modern historiography from being reduced to a form of mass media public relations. I hope very much that you will not remain upset with me over this matter, and, indeed, that we can work together for the common goal, of historical truth.

Sincerely,
Mark Weber

FRANK COMMENTS

I was a subscriber to *The Journal* almost from its inception, but let my subscription lapse after a year in protest at what I considered a good idea fouled up in its execution. I refer specifically to the "bad name" given *The Journal*—and the cause of historical revisionism in general—by the (I will be frank) amateurishness and ineptness of the then-editor, who I believe operated under a pseudonym.

With each issue I received during that first year of publication, I fairly cringed upon reading the "A Note from the Editor" section, which he

seemed to delight in using as a forum for self-aggrandizement. Was he a columnist for a public secondary school newspaper, or the editor of a historical journal that was striving for academic recognition?

It was embarrassing, I recall, to show these journals to people whom I hoped to influence, only to have them chuckle.

And so I resolved to have no more to do with *The Journal*. But after a year of not knowing what was going on, I chanced recently to come across copies of both the Spring and Summer 1982 issues, and I must say I was *pleased* indeed. I like the new format, the larger size, and most importantly, the more restrained scholarly tone. It will help out a lot in winning over to our cause more new people, and in finally allowing those leaning toward us already to be more readily able to identify publicly with you without the embarassment of having to associate their names with the polemicisms of your former editor.

So please again accept my order for a subscription!

Rederick Botha
Johannesburg, S. Africa

ADVERTISEMENT

CRITIQUE

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

DOUBLE ISSUE [SPRING/SUMMER] CONTAINS:

Secret Societies; The Hollow Earth Controversy;
Aghartha and Shambhalah: King of the World
and the Subterranean Empire;
Notes on Nazis: UFOs, Holy Lance,
Vril and Thule Societies;
A World Challenge?: Japan, OPEC and the
Silicon Revolution;
Myths of Marxism:
Reflections on Left-Wing Conspiracies;
The Origins of Conspiracy Theories:
Freemasonry, the Illuminati and Revolution;
Perpetual Motion: Reflections on
Entropy, Utopia and the Conspiracy;
Review of Philip K. Dick's science fiction; and more.
Letters, bibliography and book reviews.

SEND $4.50 (POSTAGE) TO CRITIQUE, 2364 VALLEY W., SANTA ROSA, CA 95401.

Charles A. Beard: A Tribute

Dr. JAMES J. MARTIN

(Presented at the 1981 Revisionist Conference)

I

Charles A. Beard was born on 27 November 1874 in Knightstown, Indiana, a small farming community about 35 miles east of Indianapolis. He was the son of a prosperous farmer, and a member of a family in which the intelligent discussion of public affairs was a tradition. When only eighteen years old, Beard's father bought and presented to him the town newspaper, the weekly Knightstown Sun, which he and his brother ran for the next four years. Following this experience, Beard enrolled in DePauw College (now University), in Greencastle, about 35 to 40 miles southwest of Indianapolis, an environment similar to the one Beard had been born in. Though Beard was for 50 years identified with sophisticated urban settings as a university professor and public figure here and abroad, and was to be a familiar presence in the nation's capital, his ties were always strong with the rural, agricultural world. It was no accident that he spent the last decades of his life as the resident on and proprietor of a working dairy farm in the small western Connecticut town of New Milford.

Beard graduated from DePauw in 1898, and thereafter for a few years divided his time between graduate study at Columbia University in New York and special study at Oxford in England, where he spent about two years.[1] It was while he was still in England that Beard's first book, a study of the Industrial Revolution, was published in 1901, a work which was to be reprinted at least ten times during his career.

In 1904 Beard obtained his doctor of philosophy degree from

Columbia, and then began his short but spectacular career as a university professor. He virtually founded the school of politics at Columbia in 1907, though 'political science' had been a term associated with a collection of subjects taught more or less in unison there since 1880. Shortly thereafter he began his long association with various forces and elements interested in the reform of local government, the introduction of serious technical study of its problems through scientific public administration. It was a career with many highlights, and worldwide recognition, including positions with the National Municipal League, a long string of publications on local government and a formidable textbook, *American Government and Politics*. First published by Macmillan in 1910, this book went into ten editions in his lifetime, and its revision in 1948 was one of his last literary endeavors. Probably the highlights of this side of Beard's career was his invitation to Japan for two years after the disastrous earthquake which destroyed much of Tokyo in 1923, where he contributed significantly to a major reorganization of that city's local structure and government, and his election to the Presidency of the American Political Science Association in 1926. Beard was elected President of the American Historical Association in 1933, the only person ever to hold both these posts.

Beard as a teacher gained a reputation few have ever been able to match in such a short time. Testimonials to his electric personality and ability to galvanize student participation in the joint task of learning are amazing, and memorials from those who were part of the relationship, some even thirty and forty years later, are remarkable.[2] Though he had been teaching just over four years, when it was learned that the dean of Columbia College was about to retire, in 1909, the campus paper polled the student body as to their suggestion for replacement, and Beard was the overwhelming choice. But it was unlikely he was interested in the post.

If Charles A. Beard was making quiet but influential headway in the general field of practical political labors beyond the campus, perhaps this was a sideshow to the furor he was to create nationally and even internationally with the publication of his sensational book *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, in 1913. Beard was not the first student of the impact of material considerations as an influence in the construction of the American Constitution in 1787-89. But his particular structuring of the argument drew forth a sulphurous attack, and a continuing disparagement which really has never subsided. Thirty-five years later there were still scholars trying to denature the impact of Beard's book, though studies of American history textbooks indicated that his approach had been incorporated in a resounding majority of them a quarter of a century later.

The effort to tag Beard as some kind of Marxist was especially malevolent, equivalent to the ugly smears he was to reap when he blossomed as the nation's most effective critic of the foreign policy intrigues of Franklin D. Roosevelt a generation later. But Beard was no variety of Marxist whatever. As he reiterated over the years, his view was solidly positioned on the *Federalist Papers*, James Madison's famous discourse on the unevenness of possessions as a source of political faction, as well as being quite in the tradition based on the mid-nineteenth century American historian Richard Hildreth,[3] whose works had been part of an exposure while at DePauw, and undoubtedly due to the influence of one of Beard's favorite teachers (and one-time Union Army officer), Prof. James R. Weaver. Furthermore, as the quarrel grew over the years after 1913, Beard was to re-emphasize that the title of his book began with the article *An*, not *The*, and was intended for sober thought and consideration as an important and previously sidetracked influence in the drawing together of the American Constitution. It was Beard's first encounter with the venom which is generated when a challenge is issued to the institutionally-entrenched representing an official Establishment.

The controversy over the book on the Constitution was still going on, and Beard was at work on two other books shortly to be published, when the World War broke out in midsummer, 1914. His views on the war are quite complex, and, though he subsequently endorsed the American decision to become involved, nearly three years later (which he subsequently deplored), in the early period of American neutrality he advanced no strong position. However, this was not the stance of the President of Columbia, Nicholas Murray Butler. Butler, one of the standouts of a generation of university heads who firmly believed that the chiefs of the nation's educational institutions had a responsibility to provide intellectual as well as other leadership, had strong views on most things. On the war which continued to widen until it involved most of the world's major States, he was no exception. A vociferous Francophile then and for over a generation later, Butler became especially testy over the sentiments of his faculty when such were known or suspected to lag in zeal and intensity for the Allied cause when compared to his.

It was out of this conviction that there eventuated the celebrated incident resulting in Butler's dismissal from the Columbia faculty of J. McKeen Cattell, H.W.L. Dana and then Leon Fraser, largely on a guilt-by-association basis, for known incidental company-keeping with persons considered lukewarm in their attitudes toward the moral superiority of President's long-favored side. It was the incident which led to Beard's resignation from Columbia[4] and the academic world. to which he returned for only brief moments in the following thirty years.[5]

By the time this happened, the U.S.A. was involved in the war, and Beard was an outspoken supporter of involvement. His repudiation of the anti-war sentiments of Dana, Cattell and Fraser was a matter of record. But when they were dismissed by Butler, Beard's indignation swelled, and at the end of a few months of fierce controversy over the firings, Beard submitted on 8 October 1917 a letter of resignation from Columbia which is to this day one of the great documents in support of academic freedom in its best sense. (Strangely enough, in the case of Fraser, it had been Butler who had proposed his employment in the first place, in Beard's own department. Beard opposed his hiring, but after he had been employed, Beard was dead set against his firing. Aggravated by what happened to Dana and Cattell, the dismissal of Fraser was the last straw, so to speak. The subsequent eminence of the careers of Dana and Cattell has drawn much comment over the years but few followed that of Fraser. In the mid-thirties he was chairman of the board and president of the Bank of International Settlements and in 1937 became president of the First National Bank of New York.[6] One might be led to comment that Butler's talent for dismissing the competent was demonstrable.)

It has been advanced by various commentators on Beard's career that walking away from an influential and well-paid professorial post such as that he held at Columbia was an act of more than ordinary courage, since it left him with the problem of support for a wife and two children. But it turned out to be no catastrophe, as one unacquainted with the scope of Beard's diligence and imagination might conjecture. He was already engaged in a joint labor with William C. Bagley, which bloomed as a textbook destined for nation-wide acceptance and use.

Macmillan published *A History of the American People* in 1918, not long after the resolution of the confrontation at Columbia. In its various editions, one adapted for use by the American Army Educational Commission, another for the California public school system (over 600,000 copies here alone), and a third tailored to the lower school and junior high school co-authored with Bagley published in 1920 and 1922 sold in excess of 600,000 more copies. In this time, after separating from Columbia, Beard was feverishly involved in his labors in behalf of various institutions working professionally to improve and reform American local government, and the climax of his activities in the early 1920s was his invitation for the two-year stay in Japan, and shortly after that his election to the presidency of the American Political Science Association.

Beard's unsurpassed skill at condensation, generalization and synthesis suited well a writing career which involved joint work with some forty other writers. His two works with Harry Elmer

Barnes's favorite teacher at Columbia, James Harvey Robinson, *History of Europe: Our Own Times* and *Outlines of European History* (this also including a second co-worker, the famed Orientologist, James H. Breasted), sold in excess of a million copies. But perhaps Beard's greatest triumph and claim to permanent fame as a historian was a result of a pair of joint works with his wife, Mary Ritter Beard, a formidable writer of history in her own right. The first 2-volume work, *The Rise of American Civilization*, appeared in the spring of 1927. Its influence is incalculable, and those who have borrowed from it or who have cited from it or made other use of it surely are a vast number. The sequel, also in 2 volumes, *America in Mid-Passage*, appeared on the eve of World War Two. It is instructive to note that these ponderous tomes (the four volumes in their original hardcover editions weighed in excess of ten pounds) were written not for the Academy and the professoriat but for the general reader. Their adoption as Book of the Month club selections in their time testifies in part to that. In fact, it can be advanced that Beard was the last historian of top repute in this land to write for the general public, and for not once patronizing it and deliberately writing down to it.

Beard's books in his lifetime may have sold in excess of 12,000,000 copies.[7] Inadequate information on the many translations (some editions were in Braille) and publications abroad (editions of various titles appeared in Britain, Germany, Brazil, Japan, Austria, Switzerland, Mexico and elsewhere) make the determination of a precise figure difficult, but editions subsequent to Beard's demise have been quite inadequately accounted for as well (an updated edition of the widely hailed wartime *Basic History of the United States* [1944] was released as late as 1960.) The total over the more than 80 years since the publication of his first work in 1901 may exceed fifteen million, worldwide, while, when it comes to total readership in that span of time, using estimates and techniques adopted by total readership surveys conducted to determine total magazine readership by *N.W. Ayer and Son's Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals*, one is not likely to be far off the mark in concluding Charles A. Beard's readers, of one work or another, to be in the seventy-five million range.

But in assessing these awesome statistics and projecting others in the absence of hard evidence on the basis of the known total situation we should pay attention to something even more important: the *substance* of Beard's historical writing in terms of *quality*, its *impact*, and its *enduring significance*. Particularly apropos in this context is the closing paragraph in the essay on Beard as a historian by Professor Howard K. Beale, the editor of

the symposium and mini-festschrift in Beard's honor published in 1951:

> Yet it is not the quantity but the quality of Beard's writing that gives it importance. His *Industrial Revolution* was one of the first books on that important phenomenon. His and Robinson's writings on European history, in which Beard was responsible for most of the economic element, pioneered in "the new history" that emphasized social and economic forces and ideas. *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, his *Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy*, and his *Economic Basis of Politics* profoundly affected American historiography. The first of these and his last two books on foreign policy have excited more controversy and more denunciation than any other history of the half century. His *Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy*, parts of *The Rise of American Civilization*, *The Idea of National Interest*, and *The Open Door at Home* rank among the small number of great American books that deal with the history of ideas. His and Mary Beard's *America in Midpassage* is a great example of a successful synthesis, which is overshadowed by the even better *Rise of American Civilization*, one of the most highly praised books of the century and probably the most successful large-scale synthesis in American historical writing.[8]

Beard the master synthesist did not entirely obscure Beard the student of special studies. The scope of his understanding of the latter may be discerned by the wide range of books he reviewed. One of these special areas was the field of revisionist studies dealing with the origins of the World War and the circumstances attending America's involvement. Though a supporter of Wilson and involvement at the start, like several others, Beard soon repudiated his enthusiasm and joined the critics and revisionists, even though he made no special studies himself. His acceptance of the revisionist diplomatic studies, which repudiated the German war guilt thesis, the basis for the Versailles settlement of 1919-21, was rapid. He enthusiastically reviewed the works of Barnes and Sidney B. Fay in this area in the late '20s, and summarized its upshot in a remarkable paragraph in the 1927 *Rise of American Civilization*, published in April. Following a searing quotation from Sir Philip Gibbs' *Now It Can Be Told*, Beard added the following:[9]

> To the confessions of once-muzzled journalists were added more impressive documents. When Russian, German and Austrian archives were torn open by revolution, the secret negotiations, conversations, agreements, and treaties by which the Entente Powers had planned to break Germany and divide the spoils of war, according to the ancient rules, were exposed to the public gaze. In all its naked horror the sordid and grimy diplomacy which had precipitated the bloody conflict was revealed; and by way of supplement memoirs, papers, treaties, and articles on the back-

> ground of the war began to flow from the presses. Though cautious editors long ignored the researches of scholars, though aged club men and embattled women continued to fight the war along canonical lines, the task of keeping alive the old reverie was far beyond their powers.

In fact, Beard was of the view that "the spell of the war to end war (he did not enclose these last five words in quotes) was shattered" "by the spring of 1920." Most Americans in the academic world started disavowing their one-time high zeal for it all. The deflation of the academic participation in the war auxiliary was carried out with especial conviction in H.L. Mencken's new journal, *The American Mercury*, and Beard was a contributor to the very first volume in 1924. But there probably were few American historians who had labored so hard in promoting "Mr. Wilson's war" who had the nerve to read the famous estimate of their work in Mencken's journal later on, by C. Hartley Grattan, titled "The Historians Cut Loose." (*The American Mercury*, August, 1927.)

II

The closing years of the 1920s, the national troubles signalled by the stock market collapse in October, 1929 (though several somewhat lower "lows" were to be experienced down into 1932) and the era of general malaise of the early 1930s found Beard as busy writing as ever, updating older books and turning out a stream of articles for various journals of both scholarly and general interest. It was the time when he began to show the first indications of a serious and sustained interest in American foreign policy as such, as opposed to attention to this field submerged in general accounts and sweeping narratives which tried to take the entire scope of affairs into consideration.

It can be advanced that his concentration on foreign policy and foreign affairs is traceable mainly from works produced in the early 1930s, especially two slim volumes published in 1934 and obviously put together before that, *The Idea of National Interest* and *The Open Door at Home*. One may argue that the World War had been a personal catastrophe for him, and sobered rumination on its consequences colored several of his writings in the decade after it ended. He demonstrably was aware of the changed season in American thinking after 1890 and thereabouts, with the emergence of a variety of American imperial[10] thinking as best exemplified by Alfred Thayer Mahan, Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge and Albert J. Beveridge, whom he was to characterize in 1939 as "four of the most powerful agitators that ever afflicted any nation." Beard even had flashes of presentiment as to where the inexorable American expansion into the world was

taking its people, as when, shortly after returning from Japan, he wrote a speculative piece published in *The Nation* in March, 1925 on what he saw as the coming war with Japan might accrue to the U.S.A.[11] His repeated articles during the 1920s on the continuous pressure for the creation of an ever larger Navy and the relation of this to sustained global expansion is another side of his picture of the world and America's increased presence in it. But it was not until the coming of the New Deal that we find him taking the time to write a book length work on the substance of foreign politics.

Like an immense swath of Americans of all persuasions, Beard initially looked with favor on the Roosevelt New Deal, especially that part of its program (divided by some into "the Three Rs," relief, recovery, and reform) which constituted the effort to emerge from the economic slump, "recovery" (in actuality a global disaster, and as traceable to the profound planetary dislocations caused by the war of 1914-1918 as to any of the technical aberrations so prized by economist analysts.) Beard even subscribed to the idea of "national planning" of a sort, but more in harmony by far with ideas one can discern in plenitude in the pages of the *Harvard Business Review* and the publications of the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School than those current among the likes of Bolshevik and related collectivists. (A perusal of the top rank business school theorists in their writing between 1917 and 1932 reveals the firm outlines of the "mixed economy" and "government-in-partnership-with-business" views which evolved into working models well before anyone got around to blaming it all on John Maynard Keynes.)

Few persons of prominence in the land were as generous as Beard in affording the New Deal a chance to succeed. He wavered back and forth between an eagerness to believe it could succeed in bringing about national economic recovery and a kind of hardheaded realization, which probably stemmed from his own canny business sense, that it could not. And if it did not, then what? Right away he sensed the likelihood that a very attractive alternative scheme would be to try to solve the nation's dolors by dissolving them into a much bigger pool of such: the world's. As early as the winter of 1934-35 we find Beard making a remarkable speculation in this direction, published in the February, 1935 issue of *Scribner's Magazine* ("National Politics and War," pp.65-70): "Confronted by the difficulties of a deepening domestic crisis and by the comparative ease of a foreign war, what will President Roosevelt do? Judging by the history of American politicians, he will choose the latter." FDR's discovery of sin abroad in the early fall of 1937 after the horrendous return of depression collapse that summer seemed to be an almost eerie following-out of a course already planned, and previously

divulged, by Beard. One can see in Beard's piece in *Scribner's* in 1935 the germ of the much more expanded version of this thesis in his 1939 book, *Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels.*

Beard's own ideas of a desirable policy were expressed in *The Open Door at Home*, after he had explored the slippery abstraction called "national interest" from all angles, demonstrating sufficiently that it masked the interests of individuals and small groups far more often than reflecting a true general hope or concern. At the core of his own views for national procedure was the belief that autonomy, whether or not desirable, was surely possible. Since 95% of the country's commerce was internal or domestic, policy should be based on this reality, and foreign trade effectively muffled. To satisfy the need for the remainder that presumably could not be locally produced, Beard suggested the stepping up of research into substitutes. His system eventually graduated into what was described as 'continentalism," and extended more or less to incorporate the Western Hemisphere. It was a program of reduced aspirations which he called "national self-restraint," eminently more attainable, he asserted, than the possibility of restraining fifty other countries in an international convention, or having to go to war with one or more of them. Beard found in the incessant and interminable search for foreign commerce one of the steady producers of the instigations of international armed conflict. But hanging like a pall over much of his work in the 1933-39 period, as reflected especially in his foreign policy and public affairs books and articles, was the recurring thought that sooner or later the United States was going to be carried into another war. One of his least successful volumes, *The Devil Theory of War*, published in 1936 (Vanguard), incorporated in its subtitle, *An Inquiry into the Nature of History and the Possibility of Keeping Out of War*, perhaps the substance of what all his furious production during those times was about.

Though the year 1936 did not reveal any serious concern with world affairs or edging in the direction of involvement somewhere in some state of belligerency on the part of Roosevelt's regime, there being many opportunities for such in that year of world upheaval, it probably was reason for dubiety on the part of someone once-burnt, twice-shy as Beard. But all one heard from the White House were sweet cooings about the beauties of peace, in FDR's speech at Chautauqua, N.Y., on 14 August of that year, and his famous disparagement of a national economy based on armament production in his address in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on December 1. Beard's hesitancy might have been based on a number of doubts and circumstances, the most important of which might have been the knowledge that the federal government had gone over the billion dollar mark for the first time in American history, in the area of annual military appropriations,

in peacetime, in 1936.

The following year however things began to take shape in the direction of the apparition Beard had been seeing since the 1920's. Roosevelt's staggering, near-total victory at the polls in November 1936, creating the illusion of an unheard-of 'mandate' and blank check to do about anything, foundered on two unexpected eventualities: the rejection by Congress of his plan to pack the Supreme Court with six more judges who might look more kindly on the constitutionality of New Deal legislation, and the horrendous economic collapse in the summer of 1937, with unemployment totals and stock market lows exceeding what had prevailed before the New Dealers succeeded to power.

The stage was set for the remarkable turnaround on world affairs to be taken by Roosevelt. On 5 October 1937 came the famous speech in Chicago urging the "peace-loving nations" to "quarantine the aggressors," accompanied by a spirited plug for the idea of "collective security," which unfortunately had also been a major stratagem urged by Stalinist Russia and the Comintern. It came as no surprise that though the speech in general appalled Americans so that Cordell Hull and other New Deal luminaries later admitted to being much frightened by the adverse public reaction, it did receive a most vociferous reception by American Communists and especially their nominal leader, Earl Browder. The anti-interventionist (at that time) liberal weekly *New Republic*, long an outlet for Beard's quite hostile views on the things Roosevelt now was advocating, created a literary 'debate' between Browder and Beard on the subject at hand. It was the occasion for one of Beard's most effective demonstrations in behalf of anti-interventionism and deflation of the enthusiasms of Roosevelt, and Browder. It was published in the *New Republic* for 2 February 1938.[12]

From this point on it can be determined with accuracy that Beard had become a fighter, not just a writer, on the foreign policy-foreign affairs front. Through 1938 into the early months of 1939, as crisis replaced crisis in European diplomatic confrontations, he saw taking shape here the firm foundations of a war party, deep in influence, prestige and resources, across all political attitudes from millionaires to Stalinists, with Roosevelt its symbol and organizational rallying point. And, as Beard had long expected and predicted, the emphasis in the conduct of public affairs had steadily shifted to concentration on evil in distant places instead of preoccupation with effecting social and economic salvation at home.

The substance of all of Beard's lecturing and writing on this political revolution in-the-making was incorporated into one searing statement, a masterpiece published by Harper[13] a few days before the Hitler-Stalin pact and the outbreak of the

German-Polish war in the late summer of 1939, titled *Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels*. The title referred to the famed discourse in the fourth act of Shakespeare's *Henry IV*, in which the dying king advised his son to "busy" the "giddy minds" of his subjects "with foreign quarrels" in the event of dire straits befalling his kingdom in domestic matters. It fit in beautifully with Beard's suspicions of the direction matters would take, from a time when the New Dealers and their President never even mentioned the subject of 'foreign affairs.' It sold into the generous six figures, and its message, Beard's editor at *Harper's*, George Leighton, said, "was more than intellectuals and crusaders among Roosevelt's followers could endure."

It was expectable that those who salivated for involvement in war someplace would heap malevolent vituperation on Beard generously. His lengthy and unnerving assault from this new perspective forced these self-styled would-be saviors of 'civilization' and 'Western culture' to assume a defensive posture, and elicited a sustained rhetoric devoted to absolving themselves of any such deviousness. As for Beard, the more intense became the assaults on him as a consequence of publishing *Giddy Minds*, the more resolute and unbending he became.[14]

If Beard had not completely estranged himself from that portion of his former liberal admirers-now-turned-intellectual-warriors by his publication of *Giddy Minds*, then he surely finished the process by his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in opposition to the Lend-Lease Bill before Congress of 4 February 1941. Another string of "measures short of war" by which the Administration became a *de facto*, if not *de jure*, belligerent, it eventually passed, but not before Beard had at least penetrated its hide with a stinging commentary. Beard objected to the Title of the Bill, "An Act to Promote the Defense of the United States," and declared that, in view of its incredibly loose-worded structure, it be retitled, suggesting a sardonic alternate:[15]

> All provisions of law and the Constitution to the contrary, notwithstanding, an Act to place all the wealth and all the men and women in the United States at the free disposal of the President, to permit him to transfer or carry goods to any foreign government he may be pleased to designate, anywhere in the world, to authorize him to wage undeclared wars for anybody, anywhere in the world, until the affairs of the world are ordered to suit his policies, and for any other purpose he may have in mind now or at any time in the future, which may be remotely related to the contingencies contemplated in the title of this Act.

Beard and the anti-interventionists lost the battle over Lend-Lease; it became public law in March. Thereafter came a continuing series of other Presidential moves and maneuvers

calculated to enhance the chances of involvement in the war but under circumstances which were exploited to try to convince the unwarlike populace that the initiative had been taken by the putative enemy. It may be that the U.S. might never have got into the war that way, or possibly by actions which would have been profoundly unwanted, because of their political implications and possibilities. (It was conceded in the summer of 1938 by Lord Halifax that war was "a very uncertain remedy" for the situation taking place worldwide; by that same time three years later this kind of sober sentiment had virtually vanished.)

A good case can be advanced that the anti-involvement elements fought Roosevelt and the interventionists to a standstill down to the end of the fall of 1941. Then came the irretrievable event of December 7. Pearl Harbor washed the entire question from the agenda. It was a grievious tactical error for the anti-interventionists to run from the scene in precipitate disarray and to remain silent for the duration of the war. It gave the Administration the opportunity to conduct a global war with a book of blank checks, unimpeded by criticism and with an opportunity to make as many blunders and mistakes as they might, with little if any accountability, and eventually to conclude the fighting on the basis of settlements so bad that the effects were still being experienced almost forty years later. But, run they did, and with them went most of the tradition of what might be termed a "loyal opposition." The resulting near-totalitarian liberal war machine was hailed by its directors as 'unity.'

Beard joined the underground too, so to speak, though he was hardly silent. Several projects occupied his time. Included was the work producing a 1,450-page revision of his 1910 political science text, and time to dwell on the Federalist Papers, almost a ritual with him; he was known to re-read them every year. During the war he took time out to produce one of the better editions, titled *The Enduring Federalist*, not published until 1948. But the two memorable achievements of the war years were a lengthy, almost speculative and ruminative exploration of the American political phenomenon, titled *The Republic: Conversations on Fundamentals*, (1943) which sold more than four million copies, and the remarkable single-volume condensation of his previous works with his wife, issued in 1944 as *A Basic History of the United States*, which sold about 650,000 copies in the ensuing five years.

Though Beard spent the war prodigiously involved in several memorable literary projects, it was known that he was also industriously collecting materials for an extensive labor on the approach of the war and also the war itself. The first installment was published less than a year after hostilities ceased. In the late summer of 1946 came *American Foreign Policy in the Making*,

1932-1940, which bore the sub-title, *A Study in Responsibilities*. It accrued some grudging and uneasy reviews[16] from the spokesmen for the New American Order now taking shape in its preliminary organization of the portions of the world not already conceded to the Stalinists or about to be conceded to the Maoists.

Beard's inexorable procedure of demonstrating the actions of the profoundly domestically-oriented Democratic Party, its eschewing of all involvements in the League of Nations, collective security and other internationalist ploys, as well as devotion to an unswerving policy of neutrality in foreign affairs, troubled the readers committed to the New Dispensation. They perhaps suspected where the next blow would strike, and thus were able to prepare themselves psychologically for it, so that when it was upon them they were able to direct upon Beard a ferocious flamethrower of criticism and personal denunciation far beyond what greeted him on the occasion of the publication of *American Foreign Policy* in 1946.

However, the interval between the two Beard books was punctuated by the appearance, in January, 1947, of the literary temblor on the question of American involvement in World War II by George Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor: The Story of the Secret War*, in the opinion of many, including this writer, still the best book published on the subject. And Beard was intimately involved in it. Perhaps the torrent of invective loosed on Beard the following year after his second book was published was in part due to the vociferous praise he accorded Morgenstern's volume, which was prominently displayed later on in the promotion of the book. In his Acknowledgments, Morgenstern stated, "The author wishes to express his gratitude to Charles A. Beard for a scholarly appraisal of this work."[17] And Beard had done so in no stinting manner:[18]

> Having scrutinized the more than ten thousand pages of sworn testimony and official papers bearing on this d' aster before I read the proof sheets of Mr. Morgenstern's book I can say out of some knowledge of the subject that his volume is a powerful work based on primary and irreducible facts in the case, carefully gathered and buttressed by exact citations of the sources. For his own inferences and conclusions, he gives documentary contexts. This method and procedure. I feel sure, will make Mr. Morgenstern's book a permanent contribution to the quest for an understanding of the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

It was an acclamation at least equalling that accorded the book by retired Admiral Harry E. Yarnell in his review in the *Far Eastern Survey*.

Though barely half or so of Beard's age, Morgenstern was no tyro in writing.[19] But it was his first book. The main case against him however was that he was a writer for Col. Robert R.

McCormick's *Chicago Tribune*. And the *Tribune* along with the Patterson papers in New York and Washington had been the principal burrs in the hide of the Roosevelt liberal camp since before the war. They had taken the initiative in focusing attention on every nuance of the Pearl Harbor story surfacing in bits and pieces all during the war. So it was incumbent upon all terminal liberals to scoff at anything coming from the *Tribune* stable being taken seriously, not only in their view lacking merit, integrity and competence, but now surely intended merely to slander their dead Leader's memory. That one as revered as Beard would leap at the first opportunity to hail Morgenstern's work as a landmark and a candidate for serious attention for a long time to come was more than they could stand. From that point on it was Beard who drew the majority of the poisoned arrows, and the volume only increased after his *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941* was published in the spring of 1948. The books were not competitors but in reality complementary, since they took on the problem from quite different vantage points. Morgenstern was mainly concerned with a meticulous turning over of the evidence relating to the Pearl Harbor attack preliminaries as revealed by various investigations of the event, while Beard was more concerned with broad political aspects of the growing assumption of government personally and the bypassing of various constitutional limitations by the President in the year and a half ending in the Hawaii attack.[20]

Perhaps it was easier for the academic and political Establishment to ignore Morgenstern than Beard. The eminence and the near-half century presence of the latter simply could not be conjured away, no matter how venomous and malicious the *ad hominem* attack became. Perhaps the most succinct comment on the impact of Beard's book came from Dr. Louis Morton, Chief of the Pacific Section of the United States Army Office of Military History. Writing in the U.S. Naval Institute *Proceedings* for April, 1955, Dr. Morton conceded:

> With the publication in 1948 of his (Charles A. Beard's) *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War*, revisionism reached the status of a mature historical interpretation of events that no serious student of prewar policy could ignore.

When the symposium *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*[21] was published late in 1953 the foundation stones for Pearl Harbor revisionism were in place, amply supported by Professor Charles Callan Tansill's *Back Door to War* (1952).

Beard not only infuriated the influential supporters of Roosevelt by his insistence that the continuous deception by the President in making his steady moves toward war while endlessly

talking about his peacefulness (few were allowed to forget his pre-election promise in 1940 never to send Americans off to a war outside U.S. borders) was in essentials, as Leighton described it, "completely to undermine constitutional government and set the stage for a Caesar" (Beard's famed peroration on pp. 582-584 of his Epilogue to *President Roosevelt* is required reading in this context.) He had opened up another sore while writing his book with a famed article in the *Saturday Evening Post* for October 4, 1947, "Who's to Write the History of the War?," in which he revealed that the Rockefeller Foundation, working with its alter ego, the Council on Foreign Relations, had provided $139,000 for the latter to spend in underwriting an official-line history of how the war had come about, in an effort to defeat at the start the same kind of "debunking" historical campaign which had immediately followed the end of World War I. Beard complained of inaccessibility of various documents, which he was sure would be fully available to anyone doing an Establishment version of the wartime past, convinced that these would be sat on as 'classified' for a generation or more. Coming to Beard's side in an even more vociferous exposure of these newest developments was the columnist George Sokolsky, in a remarkable story published nationally a week later (11 October).[22]

So it was understandable that the following February, two months before the publication of *President Roosevelt*, when the National Institute of Arts and Letters awarded Beard their gold medal for the best historical work published in the preceding decade, that his erstwhile liberal admirers would reach the end of their tolerance. The highlight of their protest was the resignation in rage from the Institute by one of its most influential members, Lewis Mumford, accompanied by abuse of Beard so extreme that it led to a memorable chiding to Mumford from Harry Elmer Barnes in a 1½ column letter to the editors of the *Chicago Tribune*, published 11 February 1948. But the attack on Beard had barely begun. With the publication of *President Roosevelt* two months later, in April, the denunciation of Beard became a veritable industry, and the most eminent of the Roosevelt academic defenders were recruited to contribute to the character assassination. Probably the most outrageous was that of Harvard's Samuel Eliot Morison, Roosevelt's handpicked choice to write a history of American naval operations in World War II, and even elevated to the rank of Admiral in recognition of his labors?[23] But the outline of the total campaign aimed at Beard is substantial, extensively documented in the later editions of Barnes's booklet *The Struggle Against the Historical Blackout* (especially 6th thru 9th).

Probably Charles A. Beard's last public act was his appearance in Washington once more, this time testifying before the Senate

Armed Services Committee on April 3, 1948, presenting testimony against the adoption of universal military training.

Beard had suffered from an ailment known as aplastic anemia, and on August 2 entered the hospital in New Haven, Conn. for treatment. His death ocurred on 1 September 1949, in his 74th year.[24]

After all the trendy faddish conceptions and misconceptions about him are assessed, discounted and dismissed, it is quite possible that Beard's editor at *Harper's*, George Leighton, had estimated him most accurately. To Leighton, the irreducible Beard remained what he had always been: a "hardnut Indiana populist" with "humanitarian tendencies." To others Charles A. Beard in his lifetime was the quintessential and ultimate irritant and annoyance to the puffed-up gasbag mandarins of the Establishment, in the words of his former student and vast admirer, Sokolsky, "one of those tough fighters who goes after a fact with all the excitement of a big game hunter," and who "abhorred the lie, the bluff, the fake and the trick." His energy, diligence and imagination made a memorable impact on all fortunate enough to know him. For the others there is the legacy of his immense literary production, examples of which are so widely dispersed even in these days that it is unlikely he will fade from memory for a long time to come.

Footnotes

1. Beard actually spent three years in Britain. His first year was followed by a return to the U.S.A. Then he came back to study at Oxford for two years.
2. See especially Arthur W. McMahon, "Charles Beard, the Teacher," in Howard K. Beale, ed., *Charles A. Beard: An Appraisal* (University of Kentucky Press, 1951), pp. 213-230.
3. Hildreth, a graduate of Harvard in 1826, produced a six-volume work published 3 volumes at a time in 1849 and 1851, which carried the story from the Columbian expeditions to the Missouri Compromise. There is a fair estimate of Hildreth in Michael Kraus, *The Writing of American History* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1953), pp. 129-135. Hildreth's opening statement in the first volume of *The History of the United States, 1497-1789* read:

> Of centennial sermons and Forth-of-July orations, whether professedly such or in the guise of history, there are more than enough. It is due to our fathers and ourselves, it is due to truth and philosophy, to present for once, on the historic stage, the founders of our American nation unbedaubed with patriotic rouge, wrapped up in no fine-spun cloaks of excuses and apology . . . . often rude, hard, narrow, superstitious and mistaken, but always earnest, downright, manly and sincere.

The result of their labors is eulogy enough; their best apology is to tell their story exactly as it was.

4. Technically, the dismissed teachers were separated from the Columbia faculty by the Trustees of Columbia, and Beard addressed his condemnation of the action to them and centered his denunciation on them, suggesting that what was wrong with higher education in the land was due to a similar class of persons in charge everywhere, When the following year Thorstein Veblen published his *The Higher Learning in America*, which especially took to task such university presidents as Butler and Ray Lyman Wilbur of Stanford, Beard reviewed the book favorably and used the satiric phrase "hire learning," which quickly established its currency and was still to be heard many decades later.
5. Strangely enough, Beard returned to Columbia for a semester as visiting professor of government in 1939, with World War II already underway and Butler still president of Columbia. Beard also received an LLD degree from Columbia in 1944. His only extended teaching in his long exile was a year at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore in 1940-1941.
6. On Fraser, see Beale's editorial note to the essay by George Counts, "Charles Beard, the Public Man," in Beale, ed., *Charles A. Beard*, p. 224.
7. See tentative compilation of the sale of Beard's books in Beale, ed., *Charles A. Beard*, pp. 310-312.
8. Beale, "Beard's Historical Writings," in Beale, ed., *Charles A. Beard*, p. 263.
9. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (2 vols., Macmillan, 1927), Vol. II, p. 673. This was rephrased but with no change whatever in substance in *A Basic History of the United States* (Doubleday, Doran, 1944), covering over half of page 442.
10. Beard's most succinct definition of what he meant by the word 'imperialism' is the following: "employment of the engines of government and diplomacy to acquire territories, protectorates, and/or spheres of influence occupied usually by other races or peoples, and to promote industrial, trade, and investment opportunities in competition with other imperialist powers or on occasion in collaboration with them where there is mutuality of interests or perils." Beard, *American Foreign Policy in the Making, 1932-1940* (Yale University Press, 1946), p. 113n.
11. Beard, "War with Japan: What Shall We Get Out of It?," *The Nation*, Vol. CXX (March 25, 1925), pp. 311-313.
12. The Beard-Browder "debate" is discussed by this writer in *American Liberalism and World Politics, 1931-1941* (2 vols., Devin-Adair, 1964), Vol. II, pp. 876-880.
13. Subtitled *An Estimate of American Foreign Policy*, this was published by Macmillan, but it was the abridged version, in *Harper's Magazine* for September, 1939, published on August 20, which reached by far the most readers.

14. Porter Sargent, the authority on American private schools, was also a testy and effective critic of American public affairs, in a succession of hardhitting books. When he started a newsletter in May, 1939 Beard became one of his earliest and most enthusiastic readers. Sargent was a great admirer of Beard's historical work, quoted from it liberally, and occasionally printed excerpts from communications he received from Beard during the tenure of the newsletter. Sargent's output down through March, 1941 was collected and published, with extensive commentary, in 1941 under the title *Getting US Into War*. It is one of the primary sources for anyone interested in the facts and opinion which circulated in this country during the 1939-41 days, in the area of international affairs.

15. Leighton, "Beard and Foreign Policy," in Beale, ed., *Charles A. Beard*, p. 182, reproduced from the published *Hearings* before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 77 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 307-313.

16. See especially the quite lengthy estimates in review by Crane Brinton of Harvard in the *New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review*, Sec. VII, p. 3, September 1, 1946, and by R.M. MacIver of Columbia in the *New York Times Book Review*, p. 3, August 18, 1946, which was decorated by an ugly insinuating cartoon.

17. Morgenstern, *Pearl Harbor* (Devin-Adair, 1947), p. xiv.

18. Comment by Beard on back of the jacket of the original edition, also printed separately on promotional material advertising the second printing.

19. Morgenstern was a Chicago native and graduate of the University of Chicago in 1930. During the War, he had served as a Captain in the U.S. Marine Corps, based at Headquarters, directing the corps of Marine combat correspondents. He became a member of the *Chicago Tribune* editorial staff in 1939, returning after the war and ultimately rising to become Editor of the Editorial page.

20. Beard's long quotations from documents, speeches made in Congress, and his meticulous coverage of the substance of the published reports and documents growing out the Congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack make the book especially useful.

21. "Perpetual war for perpetual peace" was an expression coined by Beard, to describe satirically the apparent objective of the world 'liberators' in fashioning their peculiar "postwar world," in which the United Nations Organization was presumed to be put into business largely to conduct military operations against any power "threatening the peace." Barnes was especially taken by the remark and chose it for the title of the symposium published late in 1953 by Caxton. (None of the major publishers would touch a revisionist book, even those by Beard, which were done by a university press. Five years after Beard's death it was almost impossible to find anyone who would issue a book with a revisionist thesis.) *Perpetual War* was also dedicated to Beard.

22. As things turned out, what the Rockefeller Foundation and the Council on Foreign Affairs were backing was a more rigidly

Establishment tome than either Beard or Sokolsky ever dreamed. Issued in two volumes as *The Challenge to Isolation, 1937-1940* (1952) and *The Undeclared War, 1940-1941* (1953) by Harper, with the slogan proudly displayed on the title page, "Published for the Council on Foreign Relations," the authors were Professors William L. Langer of Harvard and S. Everett Gleason of Amherst. What few knew then or later was that both authors had prestigious jobs during the war in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), probably the most overrated intelligence organization since the Napoleonic Wars, and later also had equally important posts, in its postwar successor, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), in the case of Langer, (assistant director) while Gleason, at publication time, was Deputy Executive Secretary of the National Security Council. An indispensable commentary on the first of the Langer-Gleason volumes is the first 19 pages of Harry Elmer Barnes's privately-printed brochure, *The Court Historians Versus Revisionism* (1952).

23. Morison's attack on Beard and his second book in the August, 1948 *Atlantic Monthly* had a two-part title, the second reading, "History Through a Beard." When he later chose to include this review in a book of essays he was reproached for including this utterly tasteless pun on Beard's name by the editor of the *American Historical Review*, Guy Stanton Ford. Contemporaneous with this ugly attack on Beard was a poisonous whispering campaign that he was senile, deaf, and unaware of what was going on any longer. But Beard wore a modern hearing aid, and could match anyone for acumen in the world of history and public affairs. Barnes did a masterful job of combating what he called the "senility smear" of Beard, but traces could be detected about the land for some time thereafter. Morison (1887-1976) lived 16 years longer than Beard, writing almost to the end of his 89 years. But the liberal Establishment launched no venomous gossip about him being 'senile.'

24. Though Beard had hardly become the favorite person of the editors of the *New York Times* in the last 15 years of his life, they did display residual decency by devoting well over a column and a half to an obituary of the deceased historical luminary on September 2, which was remarkably restrained in areas where abuse might have been expected. A full column editorial obituary was devoted to Beard in the *Chicago Tribune* for September 4, in which several remarks attributed to him in quotations must have been in correspondence to Morgenstern. It was in this account that Beard told of working on a third book, presumably from the period after 1941. He was quoted as saying "My study is advancing rapidly," and declaring, "It makes my last book seem like a Sunday School sermon." Nothing of the manuscript of this work has ever been described or published.

The counterattack on Beard by Roosevelt's partisans in Academe was not confined entirely to hostility to his books in review, and gained ground after his death, which seemed to encourage bravery in some circles. By 1950 a large book prepared as a refutation of Beard was published by Prof. Basil Rauch of Columbia, titled *Roosevelt from Munich to Pearl Harbor*. Barnes dealt with its major shortcomings in one of his brochures, *Rauch on Roosevelt* (1952),

though most of the professoriat followed Rauch. One who did not was the tough old Dakotan, Fred A. Shannon, professor of economic history at the University of Illinois. A Pulitzer prize winner earlier for his book on the organization and administration of the Union Army and a future president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association (now known as the Organization of American Historians) Shannon in his bibliographical recommendations in his *America's Economic Growth* (3rd. ed., Macmillan, 1951), p. 914, read:

> The most scholarly and satisfactory story of the diplomatic background of America's entry into the (Second World) war is Charles A. Beard, *American Foreign Policy in the Making, 1932-1940* (New Haven, 1946) and *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941* (New Haven, 1948). An inadequate and unconvincing rebuttal of Beard is Basil Rauch, *Roosevelt from Munich to Pearl Harbor* (New York, 1950).

Memorandum to the President

ISSAH NAKHLEH

A 13 March 1981 introductory letter and memorandum to President Ronald Reagan, submitted by the U.S. representative of The Arab Higher Committee for Palestine.

Dear Mr. President:

I have always admired you, Mr. President, as a nationalist who is determined to restore the United States to its position of respect and leadership of the Free World in the battle against international communism.

I am one of those numerous Palestinian nationalists who oppose communism and who believe that the greatest danger to human values is the Soviet empire. As you know, that empire is composed of thirteen republics, one hundred nationalities, dominates as colonies nine nations totaling one hundred million people in Central and Eastern Europe, has ninety communist parties throughout the world, and is determined to encourage revolution in every country so as to overthrow governments and make them satellites of the Soviet Union.

Only America can effectively meet the communist challenge, but first you must restore the United States to the rule of law in international affairs, to respect for the rights of peoples to self-determination and freedom and for promoting human rights throughout the world. Anything less will not give this great freedom-loving nation the necessary credibility with the many non-communist nations.

Unfortunately, there is already great disappointment relative to your declarations regarding the Palestinians and the Arab-

Israeli conflict. Your attitude is one-sided in favor of Israel. I fully understand your situation because, throughout your adult life, you have had numerous Jewish friends, many of whom are Zionists, and it is apparent you have been exposed to only one side of this dispute. You probably have never had an Arab or Palestinian friend, nor an adequate chance to meet a Palestinian or an Arab to explain to you the Palestinian and Arab point of view.

Accordingly, I respectfully submit to you, Mr. President, the enclosed Memorandum with the hope that you will kindly acquaint yourself with the Palestinian viewpoint.

Mr. President, the American Revolution was one of the first revolutions in the modern world which established by its Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The United States was the first country since 1919 to champion the right of self-determination of peoples.

The United States signed at least twenty treaties and declarations which accepted the following principles of international law:

> The Conference of American States reiterates, as a fundamental principle of the Public Law of America, that the occupation or acquisition of territory or any other modification or territorial or boundary arrangement obtained through conquest by force or by non-specific means shall not be valid of have legal effect. The pledge of non-recognition of situations arising from the foregoing conditions is an obligation which cannot be avoided either unilaterally or collectively.

By promoting and establishing the United Nations, the United States has accepted the principles of the Charter, which outlawed war and conquest, promoted the right of self-determination of peoples and prescribed the rule of law in international affairs.

By promoting and adopting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United States has pledged to promote the universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In addition to all the above, the United States as a nation observes a high moral standard and cherishes the maintenance of peace, stability and the rule of law in international affairs.

The only way the United States can deserve to be a leader of the Free World is when it adheres to the above-mentioned principles.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the United States has violated every one of the above-mentioned principles when it chose to aid

and abet the European and American Zionist Jews to occupy the ancestral homeland of the Palestinians and reduce the Palestinians to a refugee nation in exile.

I am sure, Mr. President, when you know the complete facts, you will uphold justice and support the right of self-determination for the Palestinian people. You will uphold their right to live as free people in their ancestral homeland, the restoration to them of their properties and homes, and uphold their dignity and inalienable civil, political, religious and human rights.

It will be the greatest of all your achievements, Mr. President, as leader of this great Christian nation, to restore Palestine to its sacred status as a shrine of peace and justice, where Muslims, Christians and Jews can live as fellow citizens in the democratic Holy Land State with no army, no navy, no air force—a land for pilgrimage, devotion and spiritual inspiration for all mankind.

—*Issah Nakhleh*

Who Are The Palestinians?

In order to cover up their crime of Genocide against the Palestinians, the Zionists brainwashed the American people about the Palestinians. They portrayed them as the aggressors, terrorists, murderers, fanatic anti-Semite Muslims, who want to throw the Jews into the sea or commit holocaust against Jews. Many Americans do not know that the Palestinians are the victims of aggression and Genocide. They do not know that the Palestinians were expelled from their ancestral homes, lands and properties, and reduced to a refugee nation. *They do not know that twenty percent of the Palestinians are Christians who suffered the same fate as their Muslim fellow-citizens.* They do not know that the overwhelming majority of the Palestinians, whether Christians or Muslims, are very religious, God-fearing, peaceful people. Most the them are farmers, laborers, professionals and shopkeepers, whose only wish is to live peacefully in their ancestral homeland.

The Palestinians are descendants of all the races which lived and fought or conquered Palestine since time immemorial, namely, the Canaanites, the Moabites, the Hittites, the Jebusites, the Hebrews, the Greeks, the Romans, the Arabs and the Ottomans.

The Palestinians of today are about 4,500,000. Twenty percent of them are Christians (Orthodox, Catholics and Protestants), and eighty percent are Muslims. The Palestinian Christians are

descendants of the first Christians who adopted Christianity at the hands of the Apostles. Since the seventh century A.D., Arab language and culture dominated Palestine, and this is why they call themselves Palestinian Arabs.

1,700,000 Palestinians live as refugees in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Libya. 700,000 live as citizens of Jordan, 700,000 live in Israel as second-class citizens, and 1,300,000 live in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and 100,000 live as immigrants in the Americas.

Due to Zionist control of the mass media in the United States, the Palestinians have been smeared as terrorists. The Palestinians are one of the most educated people in the Arab world. There are more professors, lawyers, physicians, dentists, engineers and teachers per capita among the Palestinians than in many other nations of the developing world.

The Palestinians Were Recognized As A Provisionally Independent Nation

When World War I broke out, the Palestinians were living under Ottoman rule with representatives in the Ottoman Parliament at Constantinople. Palestinian leaders joined other leaders from Lebanon, Syria and Iraq in fighting for national independence and freedom from Ottoman rule. Palestinians, as other Arab peoples, joined the Allied Powers with the hope of realizing their independence and freedom.

According to Article XXII of the League of Nations Covenant, the Palestinians were recognized "as a provisionally independent nation, subject to rendering of administrative assistance and advice by a Mandatory until they were able to stand alone."

Great Britain was supposed to obtain a Mandate in 1920 to lead the Palestinians to self-determination and independence. Instead, Great Britain ruled Palestine as a Crown Colony for the benefit of the Jews of the world, because of the Balfour Declaration.

What Is The Balfour Declaration?

The Balfour Declaration was a letter issued on November 2, 1917, sent by Britain's Secretary of State, James Arthur Balfour, to Lord Rothschild, in which he stated:"His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national Jewish home for the Jewish People. . . . It is being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

Great Britain had no connection whatsoever with Palestine in 1917, so why should the British Government promise the Jews of the world a Jewish national home in Palestine? The answer was given by Samuel Landman of London, who was Secretary of the World Zionist organization from 1917-1922. Landman disclosed the facts in an official pamphlet, "Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine," published by the New Zionist Press, London, 1936.

He stated how the World Zionist Organization in 1916 entered into a secret agreement with the British War Cabinet, by the terms of which Great Britain promised Palestine to the Zionists as payment for using Zionist pressure in the United States to railroad the United States into World War I as Great Britain's ally.

Mr. Landman states on page 4:

> The only way... to induce the American President to come into the War was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine, and thus enlist and mobilize the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces of Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a *quid pro quo* contract basis.

The 1939 White Paper

For 21 years, Great Britain denied the Palestinians their right to self-determination and independence, but finally issued the White Paper of May 1939, in which it stated, *inter alia*, the following:

> (1) The Proposal of partition recommended by the Royal Commission, namely the establishment of self-supporting independent Arab and Jewish states within Palestine, has been found to be impracticable.
> (2) His Majesty's Government now declare unequivocally that it is not part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish state. They would indeed regard it as contrary to their obligations to the Arabs under the Mandate, as well as to the assurances which have been given to the Arab people in the past, that the Arab *population of Palestine should be made the subjects of a Jewish state against their will.*
> (3) The independent State should be one in which Arabs and Jews share in government in such a way as to ensure that the essential interests of each community are safe-guarded. The establishment of the independent State will be preceded by a transitional period throughout which His Majesty's Government will retain responsibility for the government of the country.

The Zionists in Palestine rejected the British White Paper, and revolted against the British administration of Palestine. From 1939 to 1947 the three Zionist terrorist gangs (the Haganah, the Irgun, and the Stern) carried out the most dastardly crimes

and massacres against the civilian Arab population, as well as against officials of the British government. Many of the political and military leaders in Israel today were members of one of these three Zionist terrorist gangs. Menachem Begin was the leader of the worst of the gangs, namely, the Irgun, which committed thousands of crimes. The most notable and well-remembered of Irgun's dastardly deeds was the blowing up of the King David Hotel on July 23, 1947, when 91 persons were killed and 45 were injured. Another particularly notable crime was the massacre of Deir Yassin ordered by Menachem Begin, when 300 men, women and children were massacred and their bodies dumped into wells or mass graves.

Yitzhak Shamir was leader of the Stern Gang, which committed murders and massacres. It assassinated Lord Moyen in Cairo and the United Nations mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte in Jerusalem. Moshe Dayan, Yigal Yadin, Shimon Peres, Yitzhak Rabin, Ezer Weizmann and Ariel Sharon were members of the Haganah gang, which committed mass murders and expulsions of the Palestinians.

How The Palestinians Were Made A Refugee Nation In Exile

In 1947, the British Government submitted the Palestine problem to the United Nations General Assembly, requesting that steps be taken to determine the future government of Palestine. At that time, there were in Palestine 1,350,000 Muslim and Christian Palestinians, who were indigenous or born in Palestine and 650,000 Jews, out of whom 200,000 were born in Palestine and 450,000 who were immigrants and mostly illegal immigrants.

On the 29th of November, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly, by 33 votes in favor, 13 opposed, and 10 abstentions, adopted a resolution partitioning Palestine with a total area of 10,435 square miles, of which 272 square miles are water—into three areas:

a. An Arab State comprising 4,476 square miles, or 42.88%;
b. A Jewish State, comprising 4,893 square miles, or 56.47%;
c. An International regime for the City of Jerusalem comprising 68 square miles, or 0.65%.

When the implementation of the Partition Plan appeared to be impossible without the use of force, the United States took the lead in the Security Council, which passed a resolution calling for a special session of the United Nations General Assembly to consider further the question of the future government of Palestine. In the meantime, the United States promoted the idea of establishing a temporary United Nations trusteeship for Palestine. *President Truman issued a statement on March 25, 1948, in which he said:*

> This country vigorously supported the plan for partition with Economic Union recommended by UNSCOP and by GA. We have explored every possibility consistent with basic principles of Charter for giving effect to that solution. Unfortunately, it has become clear that the partition plan cannot be carried out at this time by peaceful means. We could not undertake to impose this solution on the people of Palestine by use of American troops, both on Charter grounds and as a matter of national policy.

During the war between the Palestinians and the Jews in Palestine after November 1947, the three Zionist terrorist gangs committed many massacres against the civilian Arab population. The most notable was the Massacre at Deir Yassin, a suburb of Jerusalem. Under the direct orders and supervision of Menachem Begin, 80% of the population of Deir Yassin, 300 men, women and children, were massacred. Begin's terrorists then herded the rest of the Arab population into trucks, and paraded them in Jerusalem to create panic amongst the Arab population. In this book, *The Revolt*, Menachem Begin admits that the objective of that massacre was to drive the Arab civilian population out of the Jewish state.

The Arab states of Syria, Egypt and Transjordan responded to the appeals of the Palestinians to send their armed forces to protect the Palestinians. Unfortunately, due to British influence on some Arab governments, the Arab war effort was sabotaged and the Jews remained in occupation of about 80% of Palestine. When the Armistice Agreements were signed between the illegal Zionist regime, called "Israel," and Egypt, Lebanon, Transjordan and Syria, the Zionist regime remained in occupation of 7,847 square miles. That was 78.47% of the area of Palestine. The Palestinians remained in control of 2,153 square miles—21.53% of the area. Transjordan unilaterally annexed the West Bank, and Egypt remained in control of the Gaza Strip.

The above indisputable facts prove that so-called "Israel" was established by genocide, by war crimes and crimes against humanity. Using invasion and conquest, European alien Jews violated not only the national integrity of Palestine, but also the human, civil, political and proprietary rights of the indigenous Muslim and Christian population of Palestine. The Palestinians were deprived of their rights to live in dignity and freedom as a people in their ancestral homeland, and were reduced to the status of an exiled nation, living in the misery of refugee camps. They were left looking for the day when they could return to their homes, properties and holy places, which they cherish more than life itself.

No people in the world today are subjected to the Nazi-racist criminal methods of humiliation, persecution, intimidation, oppression, exile, imprisonment, detention, robbery, murder and

annihilation except the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. The Palestinians live in a concentration camp style. Palestinian families are being uprooted from their lands, rendered homeless, and Jewish colonies are established on these lands. Over 5,000 Palestinian young men and women are in prisons and camps, tortured and humiliated by Nazi-Zionist methods. Palestinian leaders are being exiled, tortured and humiliated. Palestinian men and women are being daily attacked or murdered by Jewish hooligans; university students are arrested, beaten, detained and universities closed down. Muslim holy places are being desecrated. Haram Sydna Ibrahim Alkhalil in Hebron has been turned into a synagogue. Excavations are being carried out under the Dome of the Rock, one of the holiest places of Islam, as a prelude to claiming the site for rebuilding the Jewish Temple.

Jerusalem Arab inhabitants are being forced to leave the Holy City. Arab lands in and around Jerusalem and in many parts of the West Bank are being usurped to build apartment buildings for Jews in order to complete the Judaization of the Holy City. The facist Zionist leaders are doing everything to complete the annexation and Judaization of the West Bank and Gaza. In February 1981, the Likud authorities and the zealots of Gush Emunim intensified their activities in usurping a great part of Palestinian lands in the West Bank and the establishment of more Jewish settlements with U.S. tax-free funds supplied by the Jewish Agency.

The Palestine Liberation Organization Is Not A Terrorist Organization

Mr. President, you made several statements during the election campaign and one statement after your inauguration describing the Palestine Liberation Organization as a terrorist organization. With all due respect, these statements are the result of slanted misinformation from Israeli and Zionist-Jewish sources. The official position of the United States reguarding the PLO was established by Henry Kissinger in 1975, in a Memorandum of Agreement with Israel, which states: " The United States will not recognize or negotiate with the PLO so long as the PLO does not recognize Israel's right to exist and does not accept the Security Council's Resolutions 242 and 338."

This statement means that in order for the United States Government to negotiate with or recognize the PLO, the PLO must first recognize the Zionist conquest and occupation of 80% of Palestine, thereby legitimizing the illegal usurpation of the Palestine homeland and dropping all claims by Palestinians to their homes, lands, properties, their right to return to their homeland, and to live in freedom and dignity. For what? In order that the United States representatives talk to PLO representatives. This new

brand of United States diplomacy is immoral, unjust, and violates all pricipals of international law. It is typical of the crooked deals concocted by Dr. Henry Kissinger in connivance with Israel.

Dr. Kissinger is a Zionist agent and has dubious connections with international communism. By tying the hands of the United States, in agreements with Israel, Dr. Kissinger was not serving the best interests of the United States but only the interests of his Jewish nation.

The PLO is a Palestinian nationalist organization, composed of engineers, physicians, professors, teachers, businessmen and farmers. It is elected by the 450 members of the Palestine National Assembly, which is the Palestinian Parliament-in Exile. The Palestine Liberation Organization represents the Palestine Liberation movement, which is determined to free the Palestinians ancestral homeland from the military occupation of European and American Zionist Jews. The goal of the Palestine liberation movement is the restoration of the national and religious rights of the Palestine people to live in dignity and freedom in their ancestral homeland.

Right Of Palestinians To Resist Conquest And Occupation Of Their Homeland And Usurpation Of Their Rights

The people of Palestine are legally entitled to use force in self-defense, to liberate their country from Jewish occupation and subjugation. No one can deny the right of Palestinians presently living in exile, or under Jewish domination, to join the Palestine resistance movement and participate in the liberation of Palestine.

The principles of international law, and the principles of the United Nations Charter outlawed war, outlawed conquest and outlawed military occupations. Aggressive war has become a war crime, and therefore, resistance movements by the people of occupied territories against the aggressors are justified. A resistance movement is fully justified as a struggle by a people for self-preservation.

The resistance movements in the Soviet Union, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, Malaya and Burma during the Second World War set the pattern for subjugated nations in their struggle for liberation from the yoke of foreign aggressors. During World War II, all the governments of the "United Nations" gave assistance and encouragement to resistance movements against the Axis aggressors.

The resolutions of the General Assembly in recent years support the legitimacy of the struggle of the Palestine people for natonal liberation. By its resolution 2160 (XXI) of November 30, 1966, the General Assembly recognized "that peoples subjected

to colonial oppression are entitled to seek and receive all support in their struggle which is in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter." In paragraph B of that resolution, the General Assembly re-affirmed the following: "(B) Any forcible action, direct or indirect, which deprives peoples under foreign domination of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence, and of their right to determine freely their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development, constitutes a violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Accordingly, the use of force to deprive peoples of their national identity, as prohibited by the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States, and the Protection of Their Independence Sovereignty contained in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), constitutes a violation of their inalienable rights and of the principle of non-intervention."

Again, by its resolution 2440 (XXIII) of December 19, 1968, the General Assembly re-affirmed "its recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle by the opponents of apartheid to realize their human rights and fundamental freedoms." By its resolution 2446 (XXIII) of the same date, the General Assembly confirmed "the views of the International Conference on Human Rights, held at Teheran, which recognized and vigorously supported the legitimacy of the struggle of the peoples and patriotic liberation movements in Southern Africa and in colonial territories, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions." *The United States voted in support of these resolutions.*

Therefore, the Palestine Liberation Organization, as representative of the Palestine National Resistance Movement, is recognized as legitimate by international law.

It must be stated here, that under the order of the Palestine Liberation Organization, there are 50,000 Palestinian Freedom Fighters, who are Palestinian men and women born and raised in refugee camps. These young Palestinians are willing to sacrifice their lives in the cause of liberating their homeland, from which their parents were exiled. They are yearning for the day when they will return to the homes and lands of their parents in Palestine.

These men and women and leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization are not terrorists. They are freedom fighters like the patriots of the American Revolution. The Zionist propagandists keep reminding United States public opinion about Jewish women and children who lost their lives when Palestinian guerrillas took a school as a hostage in the settlement of Ma'alot. The Zionists hide the fact that the loss of life was the result of the storming of the building by Jewish armed forces who were mainly responsible for the tragedy which followed.

If the United States Government and politicians brand these incidents as terrorism, why do they not brand as terrorism the massacres of Palestinian and Lebanese women and children, who have been burnt by napalm and destroyed by fragmentation bombs dropped on them by Israelis, using United States airplanes in southern Lebanon? Over 100 such Israeli raids have been conducted since 1967 alone, and over 3,000 Palestinian and Lebanese men,women and children were murdered! Are Palestinian and Lebanese women and children human? Or, are only Jewish women and children human?

If the United Stated Administration and politicians want to be fair and evenhanded, they must brand Israeli political and military leaders as terrorists and war criminals. They invaded Palestine, occupied 80% of that country, expelled and exiled in 1948 more than 1,000,000 Palestinians and robbed them of their homes, properties and all their worldly belongings, and forced them to live in degradation and exile.

Messrs. Menachem begin, Yitzhak Shamir, Ariel Sharon, Moshe Dayan, Ezer Weizmann, Yigal Yadeen, Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres, and all the other political and military leaders of Israel are terrorists and war criminals. They were members of the three Zionist terrorist organizations, the Haganah, the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Gang, which committed terrorism and massacres against the British forces and the Palestinians from 1939 to 1948, such as the Deir Yassin massacre, and the blowing up of the King David Hotel and killing Palestinian men and women.

After the establishment of the so-called State of Israel, Zionist leaders used the armed forces to commit massacres against Palestinian villages throughout the country.

During the 1967 June war, Zionist leaders committed massacres, war crimes, and crimes against humanity against the Palestinian civilians in the occupied areas. The leaders of the Labor Government and the Likud Government sent American airplanes to bomb refugee camps and villages in Lebanon and killed thousands of Palestinian men, women and children.

Americans also became victims of Israeli war crimes when, in June 1967, Israeli airplanes bombed the U.S.S. *Liberty* which, at the same time, was being torpedoed by the Israeli navy. Forty-two Americans were killed, and 155 Americans were injured. The attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty* was premeditated with the object of preventing it from monitoring Israeli communications, which proved that Israel was the aggressor and started the 1967 war against Egypt.

Even today, Zionist leaders are continuing to commit war crimes and crimes against humanity in the occupied areas. They have turned the West Bank and Gaza into a concentration camp similar to what the Nazis did in Europe.

Zionist leaders in occupied Palestine are the terrorists. They are the War Criminals, and yet the United States treats them with respect and recognition, while they call the Palestine freedom fighters terrorists.

Lies Spread About The PLO

One of the biggest lies spread by Zionist propagandists to deceive and brainwash American politicians is that the Palestine Liberation Organization collaborates with the Soviet Union, and They say the PLO is financed and armed by the Soviet Union, and any Palestine state that may be established in the West Bank and Gaza will become a Soviet satellite.

These are Zionist fabrications and are made with the object of inciting hostility in the United States against the Palestinians. Not one single ruble is given by the Soviet Union to the Palestine Liberation Organization. The weapons used by the Palestine freedom fighters are either from European origin or Soviet origin. The Soviet weapons were bought by some Arab states, which delivered them to the Palestine Liberation Organization. The reason why Palestinians do not use American weapons is that the United States refuses to sell them these weapons, and Arab countries, buying American weapons, do not deliver these weapons to the Palestinians. If the United States is willing to sell weapons to the Palestinians they will be very glad to buy them at a high price, and not as military assistance—like that given to the Israeli invaders annually at the cost of $2,000,000,000 to the American taxpayer.

Another lie spread by Zionist propagandists is that the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinians want to throw the Jews into the sea. According to Zionist logic, European and American Jews have the right to occupy Palestine, expel the Palestinians, and reduce them to a refugee nation, scattered throughout the Middle East, rob them of all their lands, homes and possessions, and the Palestinians have no right, even to return home or resist the invaders. Can the Zionists prove that a Palestinian expelled one Jew from his home? It is the Zionists who threw one million Palestinians into the desert in 1948, expelled many Palestinians after 1967, and now are endeavoring to Judaize the West Bank and Gaza and drive the 1,300,000 Palestinians out of these occupied territories.

What the Palestinians want is not to drive the Jews into the sea, but to return home and live in peace, dignity and freedom in their ancestral homeland. The Palestine Liberation Organization declared its plan for the establishment of a secular Palestine

state, where Palestinians of the Muslim, Christian and Jewish faiths can live as fellow citizens, without any discrimination on the ground of race or religion.

The Majority Of Palestinians Are Religious—Against Communism

The overwhelming majority of the Palestinians– Muslims, Christians and Jews are very religious and devout people, who take pride in the fact that their homeland is a Holy Land, every part of which was santified and blessed by all the prophets from Abraham to Jesus and Mohammed.

The Palestinians aspire to live as free people in a holy, democratic state, which will have no army, no navy or airforce. They aspire to restore their Holy Land to its status before Zionist occupation and desecration. The Holy Land must become again the land of serenity, peace, pilgrimage and worship. It is a negation of its sanctity, indeed it is a sacrilage to keep the Holy Land as an armed Zionist camp, with the ugly weapons of destruction bent on massacres, atrocities and war crimes.

The overwhelming majority of Palestinians are against atheism and communism as a philosophy or a way of life, and shall never allow their democratic state of the Holy Land to become a satellite of the Soviet Union of the United States or any other state.

Israel Is A Colonial, Racist, Military Regime Of Apartheid

It is often stated that Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. What a farce of statement, to call such a racist regime a democracy, a regime established by genocide, a regime practicing discrimination against Oriental Jews and apartheid against the 700,000 Arabs, the indigenous population of the country, who chose to cling to their land, and who are living as second-class citizens with every type of persecution and oppression, known only in the annals of the Middle Ages! Even their children, who left the country to study abroad, are not permitted to come back, and if they go back to visit their families, they are subjected to such harassment as to force them to leave their country.

What kind of a democracy is this, which daily expels Palestinians and confiscates their homes and lands? What kind of democracy is this which is a state for Jews and only orthodox Jews? Reformed Jews are also discriminated against in this so-called democracy.

Israel is racist because it is built on Talmudic principles which

consider Jews as a superrace above all races and peoples. It is reactionary and racist because it maintains that "Israel" is a state for Jews only in accordance with the definition of Halacha, that is, strict Jewish Law. A Jew is defined as a person born of a Jewish mother or who was converted to Judaism in accordance with the strict Halacha rules. Consequently, there is no place for a Christian or a Muslim or a Hindu or a Buddhist or of any other religion.

"Israel is a testament to the inability of men to live together," wrote *Look Magazine* Senior Editor Robert Moskin, in an article entitled, " Prejudice in Israel," in *Look Magazine* of October 5, 1965.

The Council of the Sephardic Community of Jerusalem in 1965 published a booklet entitled "Danger: Jewish Racialism," in which it explained the plight of the Oriental Jews in "Israel" and the discrimination and persecution they are subjected to by the European Ashkenazi Jews. It stated: "The oriental Jews are victims of racial attitudes, Ashkenazi nondemocracy, cultural genocide, discrimination in education, and appalling living conditions."

The orthodox Jews are the dominant sect in Israel. They persecute Reform and Conservative Jews. Reform and Conservative Jews are not permitted to have synagogues, or pray in public places in "Israel."

The political, legal, religious and social system in the "Jewish State" is based on racial and religious prejudice, discrimination and fanaticism. The "Jewish State" was created for a special class of Jews, namely the Ashkenazi Orthodox Jews.

Jewish fanaticism, prejudice and discrimination against Christians and Muslims stems from the teaching of the Talmud, which abhors Christianity and Islam. Christianity and Islam recognize the Old Testament and consider Bible prophets as their prophets and teach tolerance and neighborly treatment towards the Jews. The Talmud teaches Jew superiority and exclusivity. It teaches the theory of the "Jew-master-race." The "Jew-master-race" theory as practiced in Israel dictates that a pure "Jew race" of the Orthodox Jew sect must reign supreme in the "Jewish State" without being interfered with or defiled by the presence of the Goy (i.e.,idolators or non-Jews), and without importing Reform and Conservative Judaism to "Israel."

Zionist racism in occupied Palestine is more extreme than Nazi racism. In Nazi Germany, marriage between Jews and non-Jews was not favored. In the Zionist regime in Palestine, such marriage is prohibited by law. Even marriage between Jews is prevented if the rabbis consider one of the parties is not allowed to marry.

In Nazi Germany, no Jew was prevented from owning or leasing property from a German. In racist occupied Palestine, no Jew

may sell or lease a property to a Palestinian or Muslim or Christian.

Palestinians are expelled from their homes, robbed of their properties, persecuted, segregated, and treated as second-class citizens. The following crimes and violations of human rights are committed by Israel against the Palestinians:

1. Collective and area punishment;
2. Deportation and expulsion;
3. Ill-treatment of prisoners and detainees;
4. Ill-treatment of civilians;
5. Destuction and demolition of houses and building;
6. Confiscation and expropriation of property;
7. Looting and pillage.

Some brainwashed United States politicians under the influence of Zionists usually state, "Israel is a state which shares with us the same values of morality and democracy." It is a degradation to the high moral Christian values of the United States to be compared to the fanatic Talmudic principles applied by the colonial, racist, military regime of apartheid which is ruled by terrorists and war criminals.

Israel Is A Financial Liability

The United States Administration is endeavoring to cut the United States budget to save billions of dollars from Social Security, medical aid and assistance to the poor. Instead of cutting these billions of dollars necessary for United States citizens, it would be more appropriate if the United States administration cut the $7,000,000,000 which it is giving to Israel every year, either through government, military, economic and food aid, or through tax exemptions to Zionist-Jewish agencies which are collecting tax-free, tax-deductible funds and transferring them to Israel, to assist the Israeli government in perpetuating its occupation of the lands of the Palestinians.

If the United States will immediately stop giving Israel $7 billion every year, it will not be obliged to make the following cuts in the budget, which was prepared by President Reagan:

$1.5 billion in child nutrition;
$1.2. billion in medical aid;
$1.2 billion in extended unemployment benefits;
$1.1 billion in social security minimum payments;
$ 803 million in student aid;
$ 550 million in disability insurance;
$ 172 million in cuts for arts and humanities;
$ 43 million in public broadcasting budget;
$ 238 million for youth conservation corps;
$ 220 million for vocational education

$7.026 billions

Which is better for the U.S., to finance its social, educational and humanitarian services for its citizens, or to give military and economic assistance to war criminals, to assist them in perpetuating their crimes against the Palestinian people?

Senator Adlai Stevenson stated last year in a speech in the Senate that 71% of United States foreign aid is given to Israel and Egypt, to the detriment of the best interests of the United States. This demonstrates how Israel is a great financial liability to the United States, which is endangering the best interests and national security of the United States in other areas of the world. Instead of giving Israel and Egypt 71% of its foreign aid, the United States should allocate funds for Latin America and for Asia and Africa, which is being infiltrated by communist agents, to tear them away from the United States and the free world.

Israel is living, and completely dependent on U.S. economic assistance and on funds contributed by Jews from ten other countries. Its high foreign and internal debts make it a bankrupt regime. The high rate of intlation and unemployment, high taxation, the wave of immorality and crime, the corruption in the government and the armed services make this regime an unviable state. The uncertainty about the future resulted in a high rate of migration. There are at least 500,000 Israelis who fled the country to New York and California. Soviet Jewish immigrants, subsidized by $15 million annually, refuse to go to Israel. *So what is the justification for the U.S. squandering $30,000,000,000 of official aid and more than $30,000,000,000 from tax-exempt contributions to build a military racist regime after reducing the Palestinians to a refugee nation.*

U.S. Has No Moral Commitment To Israel

It is often said that the United States has a moral commitment to the existence, survival and security of Israel. What kind of a moral commitment could there be for a state established by genocide, by expelling the indigenous population, robbing them of their homes and properties, and by establishing a fanatic, racist regime, which is worse than the apartheid regime in South Africa?

The United States has done all in its power–by word and by deed–to encourage the liquidation of colonilism, imperialism, and the subjugation and exploitation of the right of self-determination of peoples. The United States played a very important role in the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In view of these principles cherished by the United States, how could the United States consider it its moral obligation for the survival of a regime of aggression by European & American

Jews, who invaded Palestine, violated the territorial integrity of the country, occupied over 80% of Palestine, expelled over one million of its indigenous population, and, at present, occupies the rest of Palestine and wants to dictate its terms to determine the destiny of the population of the other 20%.

How can this great Christian nation aid and abet the Zionist world criminals to desecrate the Holy Land, turn it into an armed camp?

The Israel-Zionist Watergate

The foundation of the United States Government was shaken, the country experienced a political tremor, a president resigned, and many top government officials were sent to jail because of the scandal of Watergate. All these problems resulted from a simple "breaking-in" to the offices of the National Democratic Party, and an alleged cover-up by the President and his assistants of the said crime.

Israeli agents and Zionist Jews commit in the United States the most heinous crimes, defraud the Treasury of the United States with billions of dollars, and violate many United States laws. The FBI, the CIA and other United States intelligence agencies, the White House and many members of Congress, are all aware of these crimes against the national security of the United States, and yet no one dares to institute serious investigations of take steps to end these crimes and punish the perpetrators. This is, indeed, an Israeli-Zionist Watergate, more serious and catasrophic than the original American Watergate.

What are the elements of the Israeli-Zionist Watergate?

(1) Israeli agents stole 8,000 lbs. of weapon-grade uranium between 1957-1965 through the Nuclear Material and Equipment Corporation (NUMEC), formed by Zalman Shapiro. NUMEC asgreed to serve as a "technical consultant, training and procurement agency" for Israel. It formed ISORAD, a subsidary company half owned by the Israeli government. Through these two companies and Mr. Shapiro, Israeli agents were able to steal and smuggle out of the United States about 8,000 lbs. uranium, which enabled Israel to produce about 14 atomic bombs.

All investigations carried out by The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the CIA, the FBI and other government agencies proved the crime of Israeli agents. The facts were sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, who ordered the cover-up of these crimes. All subsequent United States administrations were in possession of the facts, but nobody dared open this can of worms because politicians are afraid of Zionist revenge.

(2) Over thirty Zionist and Jewish political organizations obtained by fraud and deceit exemptions from income taxes and the deduction of contributions made to them from taxable income.

They have been collecting for the last thirty years over $100,000,000 every year. They spend these fabulous amounts of tax-free, tax-deductible contributions for the following political purposes:

a. For the control of the United States media of mass communications;
b. For brainwashing the American people;
c. For influencing United States elections;
d. For influencing the United States administration and Congress;
e. For threatening and blackmailing or economically and socially destroying any American citizen who dares criticize Israel;
F. For a lobby in Washington for legislation to further the interests of Israel.

The following is a partial list of these organizations which defraud the Treasury of the United States:

B'Nai B'Rith, the Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, the American Jewish Committee,the American Jewish Congress, the Confrence of Presidents of Major American-Jewish Organizations, the Jewish Labor Committee, the National Conference of Soviet Jewry, the World Jewish Congress, the American Zionist Federation, the World Zionist Organization of America, the Zionist Organization of America.

The Internal Revenue Code entitles "Charitable Organizations" to such exemptions. "Charitable Organizations" are defined as religious and educational organizations, etc. Not one of the Zionist-Jewish organizations which obtained such exemptions is either religious or educational. They are nothing but politcal, using the fabulous amounts of contributions to dominate the political life of the United States and dictate American policy towards Israel.

(3) *The United Jewish Appeal and the Israeli Bonds Organization*: These two organizations were formed to collect funds for the State of Israel. The United Jewish Appeal collects every year between $300,000,000 and $500,000,000, and transfers the funds to the United Israel Appeal which, in turn, transfers these funds to the Jewish Agency Incorporated, American Section, (known also as the World Zionist Organization, American Section), which, in turn, transfers the money to the Jewish Agency, Israeli Section. The Land Settlement Department in the World Zionist Organization in Jerusalem plans and finances most of the Jewish settlements which were established in the West Bank, in the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan Heights, which are considered illegal under international law, according to many resolutions of the United Nations Secrurity Council and the United Nations General Assembly, and even according to the declarations of the successive United States administrations since 1967. American tax-free, tax-deductible funds, which are

collected for supposedly charitable purposes, are being used by Jews to rob the Palestinians of their lands, necessary for their livelihood, to establish Jewish settlements, and deprive the Palestinians of their livelihood.

The Israel Bond organization is collecting hundreds of millions of dollars in the United States in order to help and subsidize the illegal work of the Israeli government. According to legal technicalities worked out by the lawyers of this organization, all contributions to these bonds are deducted from United States income tax, thereby defrauding the Treasury of the United States. These facts are well known to many members of Congress; why, then, is no investigation made in Congress to expose this fraud? American Christian political organizations would never be able to get away with defrauding the Treasury of the United States in such a manner.

(4) Over 350 Zionist and Jewish organizations obtained tax exemptions and permits for deducting contributions to them from taxable income. They transmit the collected funds to organizations and institutions in Israel, amongst which are political parties, religious schools, the Israeli National Funds (which usurps Palestinian lands), labor organizations, etc. It is estimated that over $500,000,000 are collected every year by these organizations.

United States citizens of Irish and Italian origin number more than 20 and 10 times respectively of Jewish citizens. They do not collect tax-free, tax-deductible funds to be transmitted to Ireland and Italy. If all different nationalities or religious minorities in the United States were allowed to defraud the United States Treasury in the manner in which it is being defrauded by the Zionist-Jewish minority, the United States would become bankrupt. How come only Jewish and Zionist organizations are able to get away with these illegalities and frauds? Who is responsible for this cover-up?

(5) The United States has given Israel the sum of $24.5 billion in economic and military aid from 1949-1980, and $3.4 billion in 1980. It gave Israel the most sophisticated military equipment in the United States arsenal. Israel used these weapons to launch wars of aggression against the Arab countries in 1967 and against Lebanon in 1978. Not one week passes without Israel sending American airplanes to kill men, women and children in southern Lebanon. Using United States weapons, supplied by military aid in such a manner, is a violation of United States laws. The United States successive administrations never enforced these laws against Israel and did nothing more than lodge a friendly reminder to Israeli authorities.

(6) The Mossad—the Israeli intelligence agency—is carrying out illegal and subversive activities against the Arab embassies

in Washington, and the Arab missions to the United Nations. It engaged in stealing and smuggling 8,000 lbs. of weapon-grade uranium. It collects secret information and steals technological secrets from United States companies. The United States intelligence agencies, the FBI, the White House, and some leading members of Congress are all aware of the Mossad activities in the United States, and nobody dares to investigate its activities.

The above crimes and cover-up are only a few of many of the crimes committed by Israel and Israeli agents in the United States. The cover-up by the successive United States administrations and members of Congress of these crimes is the greatest scandal in the history of the United States.

(7) There are in the United States over 50 Zionist and Jewish organizations which have branches and agents all over the United States, working for the State of Israel, for Israeli political parties, collecting money for Israel and pressuring the United States Adminstration and Congress under the instructions of the Israeli government and its Embassy in Washington. Each and all of these organizations, branches, and members are engaged in activities covered by the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and therefore they are under the legal obligation to register as foreign agents.

It will suffice to mention only a few of these organizations: the Presidents Conference (an organization consisting of presidents of 23 Zionist political organizations), the American-Israeli Public Relations Committee, the American Zionist Council, the Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, the Jewish Agency for Israel, the American Jewish Committee, the World Jewish Congress, the Labor Zionist Organization of America, the United Jewish Appeal and the Zionist Organization of America.

Thousands of organizations carrying on activities in the United States on behalf of foreign principals are registered as foreign agents; only these Zionist and Jewish organizations consider themselves above the law, and they do not register. The Justice Department and the FBI are well aware of these facts and yet nobody dares to force these organizations and their members to register as foreign agents.

Israel Is Not A Fulfillment Of Prophecy

In order to justify their occupation of the homeland of the Palestinians, the Zionists brainwashed many people in the United States with many myths and fallacies. One of these myths is that Israel is the fulfillment of prophecy. It is deplorable that some Christian fundamentalists and missionaries, either because of self-interest, corruption, or Bible misinterpretation—propagate and promote this fallacy. The most no-

torious of these missionaries are Billy Graham and Jerry Falwell of the Moral Majority, who knowingly perjure their souls in promoting this false teaching.

The Zionists claim that Jews are the Chosen People and God is repatriating his Chosen People to their Promised Land. Their interpretation of the Bible ignores the coming of Jesus Christ, and that these promises were fulfilled with the return of the Jews from Babylonian captivity. The Talmudist interpretation of the Old Testament ignores the New Testament and the Christian doctrine. The Talmudists claim that Biblical promises were given to Abraham and his seed, and that they are heirs to that promise. This statement ignores the fact that the Arabs are also the seed of Abraham. Moreover, it ignores the interpretation of St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians. In chapter 3, verse 14, St. Paul states: "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." In verse 16, St. Paul states: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." St. Paul sums up the subject in verses 26-29, as follows: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, the heirs according to the promise."

It must be stated here that the Palestinians—Christians and Muslims— adore Jesus Christ. Jesus and His Mother are mentioned in many Suras of the Koran with great veneration. This is in contrast to Talmudist Jews, who are returning to "The Promised Land," who spout against Jesus and His venerated mother the worst calumnies.

Israel Is Not A Strategic Asset For The United States

Many American politicians are brainwashed by Zionist propagandists into thinking and stating "Israel is a strategic asset." A well-informed United States politician, who once was a member of the Cabinet and played many important roles in government, commented on this matter as follows: "I always think to myself, what will happen if I awake one morning and learn that Israel does not exist any more, due to a great earthquake? I do not think that this will matter to me or to anyone

in the United States. But what will happen if I awake one morning and I learn that Saudi Arabia has disappeared from the earth? I shall be, and every American will by extremely shaken, because the whole Western economy and Western civilization will be destroyed overnight." This statement in its simplicity demonstrates that it is the Arab world and not Israel which is the strategic asset for the United States.

The fallacy that Israel is a strategic asset has been promoted by certain retired United States officers who were, and are still, working for the Israeli lobby. They spread the lie that Israel is a strategic asset against Soviet ambitions to dominate the Middle East. Yet, it is the existence of an illegal and expansionist Israel that permits Soviet gains in the region.

The claim that Israel has "the best army in the world" is a piece of psychological war propaganda spread by the Zionists and their agents to prevent the Arabs from carrying out their military struggle against Israel. Let us examine the facts.

During the war between the Palestinians and the Zionist armed forces in 1947-48, the Palestinians won every battle against the Zionist armed forces, and they were in control of most of the country, in spite of the fact that Palestinians were ill-armed and ill-equipped. *It was due to the military assistance of British forces and to the air-lifting of Soviet weapons to Tel Aviv by Czechoslovakia in 1948 that Zionist forces were able to commit massacres against Palestinians, drive over 1,000,000 Palestinians from their homes, and occupy 80% of Palestine.*

In 1956, it was British and French armed forces which aided and abetted Israeli forces to occupy the Sinai Peninsula.

In 1967, Egypt was not prepared for war. President Gamul Abdul Nasser moved his forces as a propaganda ploy to pressure President Lyndon B. Johnson to renew the economic aid agreement with Egypt. The Zionists pressured President Johnson to refuse to renew the economic aid to Egypt in order to arouse Gamul Abdul Nasser. The Zionists were predicting the steps which Abdul Nasser would take as a bluff and were preparing to launch their attack to crush Egypt's military power before the Egyptians perfected their training on the use of Soviet weapons. At the same time, the Zionists were executing their plan of expansion, to occupy the West Bank and Gaza and other parts of the Arab world, in accordance with the Zionist colonial program. Israel was planning its attack while Abdul Nasser was being lulled into slumber by American and Soviet intelligence agencies, each one for its own motives.

The proof that Egypt was not prepared or preparing for war is the fact that, in the evening of June 4, 1967, a party was held

for the airforce graduates in Anshas (former Farouk palace and gardens), where practically every inportant officer in the Egyptian airforce and all its commanders were present in that party until the early hours of the morning of June 5, when the Israelis attacked at 4 a.m. According to unimpeachable evidence in our possession, Egyptian agents of the Israeli intelligence were able to put LSD in the drinks and coffee served to most important officers and top command of the Egyptian airforce. When Israeli airplanes struck at 4 a.m. on the morning of June 5, most of the Egyptian airforce officers were asleep and incapcitated by LSD.

We have also unimpeachable evidence that the Israeli airplanes dropped LSD-25, a nerve gas, on Egyptian forces in Sinai and on Egyptian military airports, and were able to incapacitate the Egyptian armed forces. These facts prove that the Israeli armed forces won the 1967 war by deception, conspiracy, and using the LSD-25 nerve gas. This does not make the Israeli army "the best in the world."

During the first stage of the 1973 war, Israeli armed forces in the Sinai and the Golan Heights were defeated, and Israel would have been completely defeated had it not been for the United States' intervention due to the efforts of the Zionist fanatic, Dr. Henry Kissinger, who was instrumental in airlifting to Israel most of the military equipment and ammunition.

In a memorandum prepared by Dr. Kissinger about a meeting he had with Jewish leaders in the Hotel Pierre, New York on June 15, 1975, Dr. Kissinger reveals the following:

a. The United States *saved Israel from collapse* at the end of the first week (of the 1973 war) by our arms supply.
b. What was our strategy in 1973? First, *we sought to break the Arab united front.* Also we wanted to ensure that the Europeans and Japanese did not get involved in the diplomacy; and of course we wanted to keep the Soviets out of the diplomatic arena. *Finally, we sought a situation which would enable Israel to deal separately with each of its neighbors.*
c. What we wanted was the most massive Arab defeat possible so that it would be clear to the Arabs that they would get nowhere with dependence on the Soviets.

We maintain that Israel is nothing but a paper tiger. This military reputation, as having the best army in the world, is nothing but a piece of psychological warfare propaganda. It is true that the United States supplied Israel with large arsenals of ultra-modern military weapons, but this does not make Israel invincible. It is also true that the Israeli airforce has the most modern American bombers and fighters, equipped with the most sophisticated electronic weapon systems and countermeasures. This makes Israel more effective against the inferior Syrian,

Egyptian and Jordanian bombers and fighters, with no sophisticated electronic weapon systems. Both the Soviet Union and the United States deny Arab countries the most modern airplanes and weapon systems. These facts do not credit the Israeli airforce with excellence per se, because the battle is not between equals and is only between a small cannon and a missile.

The prodution of atomic weapons by Israel was not the result of its technology. The French built the atomic reactor in Dimona in 1956 in exchange for Israel's giving the French government the secrets of the atomic bomb, stolen by American Jewish scientists and delivered to David Ben-Gurion. Shimon Peres, as envoy of Ben-Gurion, played an important role in the secret negotiations with France.

From 1957-1965, Israeli agents stole from United States atomic plants 8,000 lbs. of weapon-grade uranium. Israeli agents hijacked a ship in Europe with a great load of enriched uranium. These facts prove that Israel became a member of the atomic club, not because of its advanced technology, but because of stealing, smuggling and piracy.

The technological base of Israel is built by European and American Jews who steal technological secrets from the United States and Europe and give them gratis to their coreligionists in Israel.

What do the Zionist propagandists and U.S. politicians mean by stating that "Israel is a strategic asset"? Do American politicians who promote this fallacy really believe that Israel will be able to assist the United States in defeating the Soviet Union in the Middle East? Or do they plan to use Israel in wars against the Arab states? Or do they intend to execute the conspiracy advocated by Zionist writers in the United States and promoted by Zionist propagandists on radio and television to launch a war and occupy the Arab oilfields in order to solve the energy crises? If United States politicians dare to implement any of these reckless Zionist plans (promoted by Israel and its agents), they will be destroying American interests in the Middle East and leading the western world into a catastrophe. The only beneficiary of such foolish, reckless acts will be the Soviet Union.

We maintain that Israel is not an asset. It is nothing but a strategic liability. If United States Middle East policy continues to be dictated by Israel, the United States one day will be forced to choose between Israel on the one hand and the Arab and Muslim world on the other. The result for the United States is very obvious.

The Palestinians are not deceived or taken in by the phychological warfare propaganda that the "Israeli army is the best

in the world." The Palestinian freedom fighters, with inferior weapons, met the Israeli army in Jordan in 1969-70, and in southern Lebanon in 1978, and inflicted on that "invincible and best army in the world" great defeats in many battles, when the Israeli army withdrew frantically, carrying with it hundreds of its casualties.

The Palestinians are determined one day to enter into decisive battle with that "invincible army" when they are able to obtain at least similar weapons.

Israelis believe that having 14 or 15 atomic weapons is a guarantee of their security. This is the reason for their bombastic arrogance and defiance, but it is a short-sighted and a catastrophic attitude.

Some Arab states and even the Palestinians may soon be in possession of nuclear weapons. It would take only one atomic bomb to destroy Israel, but it would take more than 100 atomic bombs to destroy the Arab world. By foolishly introducing atomic weapons in the Middle East by thievery, smuggling and piracy, the Israelis are only dooming thenselves and not the Arab countries.

The United States Cannot Afford To Ignore The Resolutions Adopted In The Third Summit Confrence

The third Islamic Summit Conference was held in Holy Mecca, Saudi Arabia, on the 25-28 January, 1981, under the motto: The Session of Palestine and Holy Jerusalem. The Conference was attended by the heads of 38 Muslim states and their assistants, and adopted *inter alia*,the following important important resolutions:

1. Holy Jerusalem: The program of basic action to confront the Zionist enemy: the commitment to the liberation of Arab Jerusalem to make it the capital of the Palestinian state and the call on all states of the world to respect the UN resolutions against dealings with the Israeli occupation authorities, which would give those authorities an excuse to say that such dealings were an implied recognition or an acceptance of the *fait acompli* which they imposed by declaring Jerusalem a united capital of "the Zionist entity."

The conference decided to use all economic potentials and natural resources of the Islamic states to weaken the Israeli economy and halt the financial, economic and political backing which Israel is obtaining, and to work to change the international political stances in favor of the Palestinian people and to back the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

2. The question of Palestine and the Middle East: the conference decided to consider the question of Palestine as the core of the problem of the Middle East and number one issue of the Islamic nation. It affirms the commitment to liberate all the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, to refuse to accept any situation that would encroach on the Arab sovereignty of the holy city of Jerusalem and not to allow any Arab or Islamic side to resort alone to solve the Palestinian question and the issues of the occupied Arab territories.

It affirmed that just peace in the Middle East region cannot possibly be established except on the basis of Israel's total and unconditional withdrawal from all the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and the Palestinian people, including their right to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of their independent state on the land of Palestine under the leadership of the PLO.

It decided to continue resisting the Camp David agreement and to consider Security Council Resolution 242 as inconsistent with the Palestinian and the Arab rights and as not forming a suitable basis for solving the Middle East crisis and the question of Palestine.

It decided that the Islamic states will be comitted to the use of all their military, political, and economic potentials and natural resources, including oil, as an effective means to back the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation and in order to *confront the states* which back the Zionist entity *militarily, economically and politically*. It called on the EEC states to fulfill their undertakings not to put into effect their economic bilateral and collective agreements with Israel on the occupied Palestinian Arab territories.

The Conference also adopted the Mecca Declaration, which Stated:

> Realizing that Muslims are, in the world of today, being subjected to many unjustices and surrounded by various threats due to a logic of force and aggression, and to an intensification of the use of violence in international relations; and knowing that Islam permits to those who believe in it and to others only right and justice, and offers to those who do not fight us in our religion who do not drive us out from our homes and do not violate our sanctities only piety and fairness; and as Islam does not believe in compacence toward the unrighteous and in acceptance of injustice and oppression, we reaffirm in the face of Zionist aggression that has usurped the land of Palestine and the other occupied terrirories our determination to counter this aggression, its schemes and practices with a comprehensive resistance. We also reject and denounce the policies which make this aggression possible and which extend to it political and economic aid, manpower and military aid.

We also reject any initiative that does not adopt the Palestinian option, which consists in a just settlement to the Palestinian question based on the reestablishment of the unquestionable national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to return, to self-determination and to set up an independent Palestinian state on its national territory, under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative.

We also reject any attempt to put pressure on us or on any other state of the world in order to accept a *fait acompli* and a capitulation to unjust solutions.

We assert out determination to confront aggression and pressures by all means and to make preparations for a jihad for the liberation of the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and the sanctities and for the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people which have been asserted by the international legality and by the UN resolutions connected with the question of Palestine.

We consider the provocations committed against the Al-Aqsa mosque in Jurusalem and the transgressions on the Islamic and Christian sanctities in occupied Palestine and on the religious and inalienable national rights of the people of Palestine and the continuation of transgression represented in the decisions to annex Jerusalem and to usurp it from its lawful owners as grave reasons that prompt us to adopt a firm stand to reject this transgression and to condemn those who support it and to stand in the face of everyone who condones it or recognizes it.

Therefore we pledge a jihad with the means we possess for the liberation of Jerusalem and to make this liberation, the principle Islamic issue, the responsibility of this generation of our nation, so that, with God's help, Jerusalem will be liberated together with the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and returned to their lawful owners.

We wish to draw the United States' attention to the following paragraph of the Resolution of the Islamic Summit Conference:

> It decided that the Islamic states will be committed to the use of all their military, political, and economic potentials and natural resources, including oil, as an effective means to back the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation in order to *confront the states* which back the Zionist entity *militarily, economically and politically.* It called on the EEC states to fulfill their undertakings not to put into effect their economic bilateral and collective agreements with Israel on the occupied Palestinian Arab territories.

Should the United States continue the one-sided policy dictated by the Israeli-Zionist lobby, it would find itself in confrontation with the Arab world and the Muslim world, both of which are under the obligation to use their military, political and economic potential and national resources, including oil, *to confront the states which back up the Zionist state militarily, economically and politically, and that means the United States of America.*

In using their economic resources and potentials as a weapon, the Arab and Muslim states will be taking a page from the United

States book. They will be following the United States' example, which used and is using its military, political, economic potential and natural resources as instruments of its foreign policy. For instance:

1. U.S. grain embargo against the Soviet Union;
2. U.S. economic boycott of Cuba;
3. U.S. has consistently used the policy of supplying arms, either by sales or grants, as means of furthering its national security;
4. U.S. refused to sell arms to a state on the ground that the human rights record of that state did not meet White House or State Department standards, or that a state's politics are not enough in agreement with American positions. (Of course, Israel has always been excluded from these restrictions.);
5. Turkey suffered an American arms embargo for three years because of its action in Cyprus;
6. Placing restrictions on the use of the Hawk missiles by Jordan, and refusing to sell Jordan certain weapons because Jordan does not support the Camp David Agreement;
7. Argentina was suspended from U.S. military sales in 1978 because of U.S. opposition to its Human Rights policy;
8. Guatemala, El Salvador, Somoza's Nicaragua, and now revolutionary Nicaragua were denied U.S. weapons;
9. Both Uruguay and Chile have been denied even basic police weapons;
10. U.S. pressured France and West Germany for supplying Brazil with nuclear equipment and technology;
11. U.S. has pressured France to prevent her from supplying Iraq or Pakistan with nuclear equipment or technology;
12. U.S. reduced economic and military aid to Pakistan to prevent that country from developing its nuclear capability;
13. U.S. denied delivering to Libya the C-130 transport planes which were bought and paid for because Libya supports the Palestinians and other liberation movements;
14. U.S. influenced the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank to reduce or deny funds to countries in political disagreement with the U.S.;
15. The entire concept of most favored nation treatment is to reward those countries favorable to the U.S.A. or to influence them to do or not to do certain things.

Should the Arab and Muslim states apply United States standards of policy and precedents against the United States becuase of its support for Israel, they may adopt a resolution to implement the resolutions of the Islamic Conference and may tell the United States as follows:

> We call upon the United States to stop helping Israel economically, militarily and politically, thereby aiding and abetting Israel

in its illegal occupation of Arab lands and the usurpation of the homeland and rights of the Palestine people, and we call upon the United States to cooperate in the United Nations to pressure Israel to withdraw from all occupies Arab territories and to resolve the Palestine problem according to the principles of international law and justice.

Should the United States refuse to cooperate in finding a permanent and just solution for the Palestine problem and the Middle East problem, the Arab and Muslim states shall do the following:

1. Reduce their joint prodution of oil by 10,000,000 bbls/day;
2. Stop supporting the United States dollar and cease buying U.S. Treasury bonds;
3. Impose an oil embargo against the United States;
4. Declare an economic boycott of the United States by ceasing to buy any United States equipment and products, and to cancel all contracts with the United States companies.

What shall the United States do if it were to be confronted in such a manner by the Arab and Muslim states? Will it declare war on the Arab and Islamic states? Would it use Israeli armed forces (as many Zionist leaders urge on American politicians in private) to occupy the Arab oilfields? Would the United States carry out such reckless, mad plans? or would the United States act as a responsible, honorable leader of the Free World and protect its best interests and national security by taking the following course:

1. End its isolation with Israel in the United Nations;
2. Uphold the principles of international law, morality and justice, and stop supporting the illegal and immoral Zionist conquest and occupation of the homeland of the Palestinians;
3. Declare its evenhandedness and stop all sales of arms and the giving of economic aid to Israel, Jordan, Syria and Egypt, the belligerent opponents in the Middle East;
4. Join hands with the 110 United Nations members which support the right of self-determiation of the Palestinian people to solve the Palestine problem in accordance with international law and justice, the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Should the United States take the latter course, it will win the friendship, support and alliance of the Arab and Muslim world and it will serve the best interests and national security of the United States. By adopting such a position, the United States will restore itself to the position of respect and leadership of the Free World and the United Nations instead of being isolated in the United Nations with Israel. Furthermore, the United States will win the support of the overwhelming number of United Nations members against Soviet subversion, expansion

and aggression, in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The United States will then win the economic cooperation of the Arab world and Muslim world, which may lead to the solution of the key economic problems of the Western world.

More importantly, however, the United States will be restored to its traditional position as the champion of self-determination thereby making America a true leader of the Free World in the battle against the international communist conspiracy.

How Can The United States Assist In Establishing A Just And Permanent Peace In The Middle East?

The key to peace in the Middle East is in the hands of the United States, which must act justly in accordance with its legal and moral obligations under international law, the United Nations Charter and the principles it has always cherished and adopted in its foreign policy, namely, upholding the following:

1) The principle of self-determination of peoples;

2) That the occupation or acquisition of territory obtained through conquest by force of non-pacific means shall not be valid or have any legal effect. The pledge of non-recognition of situations arising from the forgoing conditions is an obligation which cannot be avoided, either unilaterally or collectively;

3) That no people have any right to commit genocide against other people, expel them from their homeland, rob them of their homes, properties and all their worldly belongings and violate their inalienable rights;

4) Promotion and respect for human rights.

A Plan For Peace

1. The United States should issue a statement under the title DECLARATION OF PEACE FOR THE MIDDLE PEACE, stating the following:

a. That it is important for the well-being, safety and future of the peoples of the Middle East to put an end to all belligerent acts and wars and establish permanent peace based on justice and the right of self-determination of peoples and respect for the inalienable rights and human rights of all the peoples in the area;

b. That peace in the Middle East will serve the best interests of not only the peoples of the area but of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, and will serve the cause of international peace and security as prescribed by the United Nations Charter;

c. As a first step towards peace, the United States shall follow an even-handed policy in the Middle East, based on the following principles:
1) Complete neutrality;
2) Suspension of all military sales and military shipments for 36 months to the belligerent states in the Middle East, namely, Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon;
3) Suspension of all economic aid to the above-named countries for the same period of 36 months, except for humanitarian causes.
2. The United States should consult with the other four permanent members of the Security Council and request a Special Session to implement a Middle East peace plan on the following lines:
a. The Security Council must obtain a declaration from Israel, Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon undertaking to stop all military and paramilitary actions or threats of such actions against each other for a period of 36 months;
b. The Security Council should follow the precedent adopted by the Secuity Council and the General Assembly in 1957 by calling upon Israel to unconditionally withdraw all its armed forces from all the areas it occupied in 1967, namely, the Sanai Penninsula, the Golan Heights, the West Bank and Gaza.

This action by the Security Council is in conformity with what President Eisenhower laid down as the rule of law in such a situation. He stated in his speech in 1957 the following: "Israel seeks something more. It insists on firm guarantees as a condition of widthdrawing its forces of invasion. This raises a question of principle. Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory be allowed to impose conditions on its own withdrawal? If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the organization and our best hope of establishing a world order."

This declaration of international law by the President of the United States in 1957 makes the Camp David Agreement between Israel and Egypt null and void. President Carter imposed that agreement on Egypt by undue influence in violation of the sovereignty of Egypt. Egypt was forced to submit to conditions which violate its traditions, its principles, its best interests and its sovereignty, and allowed Israel to continue the occupation of some parts of Sanai until 1982. All these conditions are null and void, and therefore Israel must immediately and completely withdraw from the territory of Egypt:
c. Immediately after Israel withdraws its forces to the borders of June 4, 1967, the Security Council shall appoint a commission composed of six members of the Security Council and

the Holy See to be named THE PALESTINE PEACE COMMISSION, and entrusted with the task of finding a solutionto the Palestine problem within six months;

d. The Palestine Peace Commission shall ascertain the wishes of the Palestinian Jews and Palestinian Arabs about the following matters:

1) Can the Palestinian Arabs and Palestinian Jews live together in the Holy Land state which shall be:

a) A unitary state?; or

b) A state of federal cantons, as in Switzerland?

2) How can Palestine be made again the Holy Land of Peace, open for the pilgrimage of peoples of all faiths?

3) How can the Palestine refugees return home and take possession of their homes and properties in Palestine?

4) How can Muslims, Jews and Christians live peacefully as fellow citizens in the Holy Land state, with dignity, with human rights and with freedom for all?

5) Whether the Holy Land state and Jordan should enter into a federation or a confederation?

After the Palestine Peace Commission submits its report and recommendations to the Security Council, and a solution is approved, it must be enforced by the force of world public opinion and through the powers entrusted to the United Nations Security Council.

This is the only road to a permanent, just and workable peace in Palestine and the Middle East. All attempts to perpetuate the present situation established by war and conquest and injustice will only lead to more wars and bloodshed. All proposals to confirm the *fait accompli* of Israeli occupation of any part of the Arab territories, provide security guarantees for the Israeli occupiers, and postpone a just solution of the Palestine problem in all its aspects will only postpone the decisive bloody battle between Jews and Arabs, which may lead to a nuclear holocaust.

No solution can be just or permanent if it fails to redress the injustice committed against the Palestinians. Palestine Arabs and Palestine Jews must live as fellow citizens in a Holy Land of peace which should become "a beacon light" for all the civilized world.

The Inside Story of the Hess Flight

ANONYMOUS

On 10 May 1941, Rudolf Hess made his daring flight from Germany to Britain in a vain bid to stop the tragic conflict between two nations he admired and loved. When Hitler's Deputy parachuted to earth from a Messerschmitt fighter over south Scotland, Germany and Britain had already been at war with each other for twenty months.

It is well known that Hess made this unprecedented move to impress on Britain's war leaders just how earnestly Germany desired peace. But even after the passage of forty years, much about the famous episode remains shrouded in mystery. The biggest question is whether Hitler knew in advance about the flight. Did he even order Hess on this mission of peace, as some insist? We cannot be sure if Hess would reveal the truth if he could. His ardent loyalty to Hitler might keep him from telling the whole story even if he were able. The truth may not be known until the secret British government documents on the matter are one day finally removed from the closed archives and made available to the world in uncensored form.

Still, there is strong evidence that Hess risked his life for peace under orders from Adolf Hitler himself. In its issue of May 1943, the American Mercury published "The Inside Story of the Hess Flight," a remarkable article which self-assuredly reported that the flight was personally directed by Hitler and completely expected by the British.

In 1943 the American Mercury was a popular, highly successful and very "establishment" monthly. It was quite different from the

iconoclastic journal that H. L. Mencken had founded and edited many years before.

Although the article on the Hess flight appeared anonymously, the magazine's editors vouched for its accuracy: "The writer, a highly reputable observer, is known to us and we publish this article with full faith in its sources." The Reader's Digest published a condensed version of the piece in its July 1943 issue and likewise declared it accurate: "According to Allan A. Michie, The Reader's Digest's London correspondent, this account of the Hess flight corresponds to the version accepted by well-informed journalists in Britain."

Written in the midst of war, the author's bellicose joy at the failure of the Hess peace venture may appear regrettable and even contemptible today. Still, the information it contains (if correct) puts both Germany and Britain in a very different light than the one originally intended by the author. Because of its unquestionable historical importance, this article deserves serious consideration today.

—Mark Weber

I

Why Rudolf Hess took the sky road to Scotland has never been revealed officially, principally because two leaders of Allied strategy, Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, believed at the time that no useful purpose could be served by the telling. Hess was consigned to the limbo of hush-hush and all attempts to probe the craziest episode of the war were resolutely suppressed.

Today, two years after, many Englishmen and a few Americans know exactly why Hess came to England, and most of those in possession of the true story feel that it should now be told. For one thing, it would place before critics of Anglo-American policy towards Soviet Russia the vital and silencing fact that at a difficult moment, when he might have withdrawn his country from the war at Russia's expense, Churchill pledged Britain to continue fighting as a full ally of the newest victim of Nazi duplicity. There would have been some semblance of poetic justice to such a withdrawal—was it not Stalin who set the war in motion by signing a friendship pact with Hitler in 1939? But the British Prime Minister never even considered such action.

A few details are still unclear—only British Intelligence and several top-flight officials know them; a few facts must still be

kept dark for reasons of policy. But the essential story can be safely, and usefully, told. It makes one of the most fascinating tales of superintrigue in the annals of international relations. It adds up to a supreme British *coup* that must have shattered the pride of the Nazis in their diplomacy and their Secret Service. In that domain, it is fair to say, the Hess incident is a defeat equivalent to Stalingrad in the military domain.

Rudolf Hess did not "escape" from Germany. He came as a winged messenger of peace, and no Parsifal in shining armor was ever more rigorously and loyally consecrated to his mission. He came not only with Adolf Hitler's blessing, but upon Hitler's explicit orders. Far from being a surprise, the arrival of Hess was expected by a limited number of Britishers, the outlines of his mission were known in advance, and the Nazi leader actually had an RAF escort in the final stage of his air journey.

On the basis of reliable information since obtained from German sources and from indications given by Hess himself, it is possible to reconstruct the situation in Berlin that led to the mad Hess undertaking.

By the beginning of 1941 Hitler, in disregard of the advice of some of his generals, had decided that he could no longer put off his "holy war" against Russia. The attempt to knock out the Western democracies before turning to the East had failed. The alternative was an understanding with Great Britain which would leave Germany free to concentrate everything against Russia—a return, in some measure, to the basis of co-operation set up in Munich. Whatever Chamberlain and Daladier may have thought, the Germans had interpreted the Munich deal as a *carte blanche* for Nazi domination of Eastern Europe. The Allied guarantees to Poland and Rumania thereafter and their declaration of war, were indignantly denounced in Berlin as a democratic double-cross.

Hitler put out a tentative feeler in January 1941 in the form of an inquiry regarding the British attitude towards possible direct negotiations. It was not directed to the British Government but to a group of influential Britishers, among them the Duke of Hamilton, who belonged to the since discredited Anglo-German Fellowship Association. An internationally known diplomat served as courier. In the course of time a reply arrived in Berlin expressing limited interest and asking for more information. Tediously, cautiously, without either side quite revealing its hand, a plan was developed. When the German proposal of negotiations on neutral soil was rejected, Berlin countered with an offer to send a delegate to England. After all, had not Chamberlain flown to Germany?

A delegate was selected—Ernst Wilhelm Bohle, Gauleiter of all Germans abroad. Handsome, South African-born, Cambridge-

educated Willi Bohle was actually a British subject, though his passport was considerably out of date, and he seemed ideally suited for the mission. Several important foreign journalists in Berlin were let in on the secret that Bohle was being groomed for a very big and mysterious job abroad, and the story was planted in Turkish and South American papers to test British reaction. When weeks passed and the British press did not pick up the story, thus indicating an indifference to Bohle, Berlin became worried.

It was then that the Führer came through with one of his "geniale" ideas. Bohle was not the right man, he said. He did not have the national stature to impress the British. A really big Nazi would have to go, one whose name was inseparably linked with Hitler himself and whose presence could not possibly fail to command attention. He must be one, said Hitler, who would represent the "goodness" of the German race, one whose sincerity was unquestionable. What is more, he must be able to speak officially for the German Government and to give binding commitments on the behalf of the Führer. Providence, Hitler pointed out, had given Germany just the man—Walter Richard Rudolf Hess, Nazi Number Three, who in addition to fulfilling the other qualifications had grown up in the English quarter of Alexandria, spoke fluent English and "understood the British mind."

After Hitler transmitted his supreme and final offer—to send his own Deputy and closest friend directly to England—there was a long delay in replying. Possibly the imperturbable British required some time to recover from their astonishment. But finally Adolf's intuition was justified—an acceptance of the proposal came through, details were arranged, and on May 10 Hess flew into the twilight.

Four months of intricate negotiations had preceded the flight. The Germans had pushed their proposal in the name of peace and Nordic friendship. Their British "friends" were co-operative without being too eager or too optimistic—there was no use overlooking the difficulties. As was only natural, progress was made slowly; there were ups and downs in the fortunes of the enterprise.

II

The one thing the Germans did not know was that they were negotiating with agents of the British Secret Service using the names—and the handwriting—of the Duke of Hamilton and other gentry of the Anglo-German Fellowship Association! The fact is that the initial communication, in January, brought personally by an eminent diplomat, never reached its destination, having been intercepted by the Secret Service. From then on the corre-

spondence was handled entirely by astute British agents. Replies designed to whet the German appetite, replies encouraging the supposition that Britain was seeking a way out of its military difficulties, were sent to Berlin. The hook was carefully baited that caught the third largest fish in the Nazi lake.

It was perhaps his perverted love of Wagnerian contrast that led Hitler to choose the night of his Deputy's fateful flight for unloading five hundred tons of noisy death on London.

That night the subterranean plotting room of the RAF Fighter Command was static with activity. The heaviest Nazi bomber force ever sent to Britain was pounding the capital, and new waves of planes were crossing the coast every fifteen minutes. When a report from an outlying radiolocation station on the Scottish coast announced the approach of an unidentified plane, the receiving operator at Fighter Command checked it off as "one of ours" and promptly forgot it. On the tail of the first report came a second: the plane had failed to identify itself properly and its speed indicated that it was a fighter. Methodically, as one immune to surprises, the operator sent his flash to the plotting room and a hostile plane was pinpointed far up on the eastern coast of Scotland with an arrow to indicate that it was moving west.

By now inland stations were also picking up the mystery plane, obviously a fighter from its speed, although Scotland was far beyond the normal cruising range of any fighter. Consulted, the commanding officer at Fighter Command reacted in a manner that Fighter Command personnel still discuss with varying degrees of puzzlement. "For God's sake," he is reported to have shouted, "*Tell them not to shoot him down!*" In a matter of seconds a fighter station in Scotland received a flash and two Hurricanes took off to trail the mystery plane with orders to force it down *but under no conditions to shoot at it.* While the small red arrows on the plotting table crept across Scotland, high officers at Fighter Command watched with absorbed interest. Near the tiny village of Paisley, almost on the west coast, they stopped. "Made it," the commanding officer is reported to have grunted. "Thank God, he's down!"

In Lanarkshire, Scotland, David McLean, a farmer, watched a figure parachute into his field, and by the time the man had disentangled himself from the shrouds of his parachute, Farmer McLean was standing over him with a pitchfork. "Are ye a Nazi enemy, or are ye one o' ours?" he asked. "Not Nazi enemy; British friend," the man replied with some difficulty because he had wrenched his ankle and was in extreme pain. Helped into the farmer's kitchen, he announced that his name was Alfred Horn and that he had come to see the Duke of Hamilton, laird of the great Dungavel estate ten miles away. The man talked freely, and

to local Home Guardsmen Jack Paterson and Robert Gibson, who had arrived in the meantime, he admitted that he had come from Germany and was hunting the private aerodrome on Hamilton's estate when his fuel gave out and he had to bail out. "My name is Alfred Horn," he repeated frequently as though seeking recognition. "Please tell the Duke of Hamilton I have arrived."

With their instinctive distrust of aristocracy, the canny Scots became suspicious of the whole situation, and the parachutist was bundled off to the local Home Guard headquarters, where an excited, argumentative crowd soon gathered. Meanwhile, a kind of official reception committee composed of Military Intelligence officers and Secret Service agents was waiting at the private aerodrome on the Hamilton estate. The forced landing ten miles from the prearranged rendezvous was the only hitch in the plan. It was the hitch, presumably, which broke to the whole world sensational news which otherwise might have been kept on ice for a while if not for the duration.

When the "reception committee" heard of the accident and finally found their visitor, he was being guarded by over a dozen defiant Home Guardsmen who were determined not to relinquish him. It took lengthy assurances that the man would remain safe in their custody, plus the arrival of Army reinforcements under instructions to co-operate with the "committee," to persuade the Guardsmen to give up their prisoner.

Still declaring that his name was Alfred Horn, Hess was placed in a military motorcar and driven to Maryhill Barracks near Glasgow. There he changed his story. "I have come to save humanity," he said. "I am Rudolf Hess." And he indicated that his visit was being expected by inlfuential Englishmen—a statement that was truer than he as yet suspected. His identity checked, Hess was taken to a military hospital to have his ankle treated, and with a Scots Guardsman on duty outside his door, spent his first night in the British Isles.

In the village of Paisley and many other parts of the Highlands, Scotsmen divided into factions—Scots nationalists and British loyalists, royalists and socialists—and throughout that night and for several days broke heads and knuckles over the issue of the German who came to Scotland. The loyalists and socialists suspected that either the Scots nationalists or royalists had been guilty of some treasonable skullduggery.

Hess passed a good night, and when his nurse brought breakfast on a tray the next morning at 8 a.m. he reminded her that on the continent one breakfasted later. She left the tray and departed, while he went back to sleep. When she returned at nine for the tray, the breakfast had not been touched, so she removed it, with the result that Hess spent his first morning in Britain without breakfast. Thereafter he breakfasted at eight.

Hitler's friend and deputy had come prepared for an indirect approach to the British Government through the Anglo-German Fellowship Association, to which a surprising number of prominent Britons adhered before the war. The actual approach, as planned by Winston Churchill, was exceedingly direct. Ivone Kirkpatrick, an astute super-spy in World War I and Councillor at the Berlin Embassy during the intervening years, flew to Scotland to receive the Hess plan for direct transmission to the British Government. Even Hitler could have asked no greater co-operation. Despite the absence of the Duke of Hamilton, Hess at this stage was still convinced that he was dealing with the Fellowship intermediaries.

It was to Kirkpatrick that the Nazi first poured out the details of Hitler's armistice and peace proposals. He was enthusiastic and voluble—the stenographic report filled many notebooks. And he was most optimistic, since he was fully convinced that Britain was licked, knew it, and must therefore welcome the Führer's generous offer of amity. His tone throughout was that of a munificent enemy offering a reprieve to a foe whose doom was otherwise sealed.

III

The terms of Hitler's peace proposal have been discussed up and down England not only in well-informed political circles but in pubs, bomb shelters and Pall Mall clubs. It was too elaborate a secret to be kept. Cabinet members presumably told their friends in Parliament and the MP's told their club colleagues and the news percolated down. The filter of time, plus such cross-checking as is possible on a subject that is officially taboo, enables the writer to give the general outline, witholding details.

Hitler offered total cessation of the war in the West. Germany would evacuate all of France except Alsace and Lorraine, which would remain German. It would evacuate Holland and Belgium, retaining Luxembourg. It would evacuate Norway and Denmark. In short, Hitler offered to withdraw from Western Europe, except for the two French provinces and Luxembourg, in return for which Great Britain would agree to assume an attitude of benevolent neutrality towards Germany as it unfolded its plans in Eastern Europe. In addition, the Führer was ready to withdraw from Yugoslavia and Greece. German troops would be evacuated from the Mediterranean generally and Hitler would use his good offices to arrange a settlement of the Mediterranean conflict between Britain and Italy. No belligerent or neutral country would be entitled to demand reparations from any other country, he specified.

The proposal contained many other points, including plans for

plebiscites and population exchanges where these might be necessitated by shifts in population that has resulted from the military action in Western Europe and the Balkans. But the versions circulating in authoritative circles all agree on the basic points outlined above.

In a prepared preamble, Hess explained the importance of Hitler's Eastern mission "to save humanity," and indicated how perfectly the whole arrangement would work out for Britain and France, not only from the ideological and security angles but also commercially. Germany, he pointed out, would take the full production of the Allied war industries until they could be converted to a peacetime basis, thus preventing economic depression. As Hess and his Führer saw it, England and France would become, in effect, the arsenals of free capitalism against Asiatic communism. The actual slaying of the Bolshevik dragon Hitler reserved for Germany alone, so that by this act he could convince a doubting world of his benevolent intentions. Hess gave no information on the miltary plans for Eastern Europe and would not be drawn out on that point, since it was a problem for Germany alone.

For two days Hitler's emissary unfolded his proposals and Churchill's amanuensis made notes. Hess was certain his plan would be accepted; it is characteristic of German thinking that it never foresees the possibility of another point of view. He emphasized that his Leader would not quibble over details —Britain could practically write its own peace terms. Hitler was only eager, as a humanitarian, to stop the "senseless war" with a brother nation and thus incidentally guarantee supplies and safeguard his rear while fighting in the East.

With the prepared plan and the emissary's annotations in his notebooks, Kirkpatrick went to 10 Downing Street. The plan was communicated to Washington for an opinion, and the President, of course, confirmed the Prime Minister's decision. The answer would be a flat "No," but the two statesmen are reported to have agreed that open discussion of such a sensational offer would be undersirable at that time. They decided that the insanity explanation fed to the German people would also suffice for the rest of the world. Unlike the Germans and some Americans, no single Britisher believed a word of that story. Both London and Washington made repeated efforts to warn Russia of the coming German blows. The Russian leaders would not believe it—or pretended not to believe it—and certain Soviet diplomats insisted that the warnings were democratic "tricks" until the actual invasion took place.

Hess was not told of Churchill's decision and was permitted to assume that his proposals were under ardent discussion. At the hospital he rested easily and talked freely with his doctor, nurses

and guards. He was tolerant and friendly until his doctor one morning made a typical British comment on Adolf Hitler. Hess thereupon staged a scene and remained surly and sulking for a week. When he was able to walk, he was flown to London, where he talked to Lord Beaverbrook, Alfred Duff Cooper and other government leaders. But Churchill refused his repeated requests for a meeting.

Only after he had talked himself out and could provide no further useful information, was Hess informed that his plan had been entirely rejected and that Britain was already Russia's ally. By that time he was aware, too, that the negotiations which preceded his flight had short-circuited the Fellowship crowd —neither Hamiliton nor any of the others had known anything about the Hess visit until all of England knew it. Hess's shock and dismay resulted in a minor nervous breakdown, so that for a while the Nazi lie about his insanity came near being true. The news of the sinking of the *Bismarck* shook Hess so that he wept for an entire day.

Hess demanded that he be sent back to Germany, because, having come as an emissary, he was entitled to safe return. The British Government reasoned differently—after all, he came as an emissary to private individuals, not to the Government directly —and he became a special prisoner of war. He spends his existence in the manor house of a large English estate, with considerable freedom of movement on the well guarded grounds. His appetite is reported to be good. He spends most of his time reading German classics and perfecting his English. A bookdealer in London recently wrote to several of his customers who had purchased German books from him, inquiring whether they would care to resell them to another client: the client's name was given as Walter R. R. Hess.

This was not the first time England reduced a German stronghold by audacious Secret Service work. It was reported unofficially in Berlin that the *Graf Spee* was scuttled on orders sent over Admiral Raeder's signature by the cloak-and-dagger experts in the British Secret Service. Whether there is any truth to that or not, there is no doubt that when the whole story can be told the achievements of that Secret Service will astound the world. And the Hess episode is certain to stand out with a glory all its own among them.

Thomas E. Watson Revisited

THOMAS HENRY IRWIN

Tom Watson made his debut in politics on 6 August 1880 at the age of twenty-three. The speech Watson delivered to the Democratic nominating convention at Atlanta on that date split the ranks of the party and provided Georgians with a choice of two gubornatorial candidates for the first time since the Civil War. Watson opposed the renomination of Alfred H. Colquitt who, together with Joseph E. Brown and General John B. Gordon, made up the "Bourbon Triumvirate." They dominated Georgia politics between 1872 and 1890 as the representatives of industrial capitalism. The press and the financial interests of the state launched a vigorous campaign in Colquitt's defense. The forces of agrarian unrest that Watson verbally cited, met with resounding defeat.

Henry W. Grady, editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, was the major apologist for monopoly capitalism and corporate power. Watson was one of the few men willing to speak out against the oppressive system that Grady so enthusiastically advocated:

> We are told in the splendid phraseology of silver-tongued orators from the city, that our country is absolutely smothered under the plenteous flow of milk and honey of another Canaan . . . . There is no romance in having landed property excluded from the banks, and in having twenty-five per cent upon money; no romance in being fleeced by a fifty per cent tariff; no romance in seeing other classes and other properties exempted from taxation, and realizing fabulous dividends upon their investments, when the lands are taxed to their uttermost dollar and farming has paid no dividend since the war.

In 1882 Watson was elected to the Georgia Legislature from his home county of McDuffie. He struggled unsuccessfully to curb the abuses of the powerful railroad corporations. A bill subjecting railroads to county property taxes was voted down after U.S. Senator Brown offered to provide the legislators with round-trip train fares to the Louisville Exposition. Watson resigned his seat and returned to the practice of law before his term expired. Watson declared:

> In the tremendous oppressiveness of the System, the chief factor of cruelty, greed, corruption and robbery is the Corporation . . . . These Corporations are the Feudal Barons of this Century. Their Directors live in lordly Palaces and Castles, Their Yachts are on the sea; their Parlor Cars on the rails. They spread feasts that would feed a starving factory town . . . . The markets of the world have been clutched by the throat (in violation of Law) and the price of every commodity taken away from competition and given to the Trust. Small dealers everywhere. in everything, exist at the pleasure of the large dealer. The individual sinks before the Corporation. The man goes down under the blows of the "Ring." Money:—combined the Court, the Church, the Legislature, the Editorial Room, the State, the School, the Home!

The Farmers' Alliance began recruiting in Georgia during March, 1887; within three years it had grown to a membership of over 1,000. The Alliance sought to organize the farmer against the forces of exploitation which had driven him into virtual peonage. Watson noted that "while every avocation has its advocates and champions in positions of power and importance, the farmer is practically unrepresented. The entire drift of legislation has been, and is yet, continuously and persistently against him." He was one of the first politicians to join with the Alliance in resisting the depredations of ruling cliques like the Bourbon Triumvirate.

Watson established his reputation as a reformer during the summer of 1888. He writes:

> A trust had been formed in St. Louis to control the price of jutebagging, the necessary cover of the cotton bale. Day after day the price was pushed up, as we have seen done in so many other cases . . . . Heartily in sympathy with the producers, I at once wrote the call for the mass-meeting; and on the appointed day, the building was packed with excited humanity.

He urged the farmers to take independent action in the form of a boycott: "It is useless to ask Congress to help us, just as it was folly for our forefathers to ask for relief from the tea tax; and as they revolted . . . so should we . . . . The Standard of Revolt is up. Let us keep it up and speed it on." In 1889 the farmers' boycott forced the jute trust to come to terms.

Watson declared himself a candidate for the House of Representatives in the 1890 election. He ran on the St. Louis platform adopted by the Alliance the previous December, which demanded "the abolition of National Banks," "the free and unlimited coinage of Silver," "the passage of laws prohibiting the alien ownership of Land," "that taxation, National or State, shall not be used to build up one interest or class at the expense of another," "Economy . . . in the expenditures of the Government," and "that the Government shall own and operate the means of Transportation and Communication." The last plank was viewed as the only way to limit the rapine of the railroads.

George T. Barnes, who made his career as a vassal of the Bourbon financial lords, was the incumbent. The *Augusta Chronicle* and other representatives of the "kept press" attempted to thwart Watson's efforts by claiming, "There is really no issue between Mr. Barnes and Mr. Watson except that Mr. Barnes is in and Mr. Watson wishes to be." The situation was, however, soon to be reversed in accordance with Watson's adage that "the new wine of reform is not to be placed in the old bottles of ring politicians."

Watson wrote: "The politicians laughed at you; but when your opponent came home from Washington to meet you in debate before the mass-meetings throughout the district, lo! the people were with you, and your triumph at the polls was unprecedented in your state." The Alliance candidates met with statewide victory.

In May 1891, the organizational framework for the Alliance's political wing, the People's Party, was laid. Often called the Populist Party, it gave the common man a voice in politics. Then, Watson writes, "the Farmers' Alliance held a great national convention at Indanapolis and *instructed* those men who had been elected by Alliance votes to stand firm for the principles, regardless of the dictation of party caucus." A referendum demon-

strated that Watson's district supported him in his intention to abide by the Indianapolis resolution.

Henry Grady sought "to bring peace between the agricultural and commercial interests of the state." His *Constitution* trumpeted, "The Farmers' Alliance *is* the Democratic party." Such rejoicing was, of course, insincere. The Bourbons were only trying to lure the newly elected Alliance representatives into collusion with the "Old Regime" and turn them against their constituents. Leonidas F. Livingston, President of the State Alliance and one of the six Georgia Congressmen sent to Washington on the wave of the farmers' revolt, was the most prominent defector.

Watson recalled: "Your political party, which in convention after convention had adopted your platform, suddenly changed front and denounced those principles. What were you to do? You decided that *principles* were dearer than *party*, and you stood by your principles." Shortly after Congress convened in December 1891, he refused to support the Democratic candidate for Speaker, and instead caucused with a group of Midwestern Alliance Congressmen. They nominated Watson for Speaker. His weekly *People's Party Paper*, launched during the fall of 1891, declared, "so was formed the first distintive political body known as the People's Party." Livingston had joined the Democratic caucus.

While serving in Congress, Watson attempted to secure homestead land loans as a way of benefitting the independent farmer and increasing the middle class. He contended that:

> Any system which increases the Moneyed Class where there is all money and no work, debauches Society. Any system which increases the class where there is all work and no money debauches and endangers Society. Any system that will add to the great Middle Class where there is reasonable work and fair reward, secures to Society the best results of which humanity is capable.

A bill to create an income tax was proposed in Congress by Watson. Though he thought that such a tax would relieve the middle class of its oppressive tax burden, it was turned to the exact opposite use when later adopted. "Now who is left to pay the Federal taxes?," he asked. "*The plain people, unorganized, unprotected, absolutely helpless.* They are bled on the one hand by the Federal government and by the Privileged Classes on the other." He observed, "How much more bitterly must these burdens be resented when the citizens who pay such taxes are aware of the fact that those who are making profits are exempted from tax." The Federal Government, according to Watson, was "The most extravagant Government the world ever saw, and getting more so every year." Protesting that "taxes are unequally distributed, and prodigally spent," he added, "it is a cruelty to the negro, as well as an injustice to the whites, to tax the latter to give 'higher education' to the former."

Maintaining that "Under Tariff Systems a tax is laid upon every article the laborer uses and the proceeds put into the pocket of his employer," Watson proposed removing the custom duties form a number of materials used in farming. "In other words," he wrote, "*these high duties on foreign goods have for their real purpose the devilish plundering of the common people by the trusts.* They hold us up, all along the line, and we are forced to pay what they charge." Watson did not oppose all tariffs, but felt they were being abused in the interest of monopoly capitalists.

Only one of Watson's Populist legislative proposals was ratified by Congress. According to his biographer, William W. Brewton, by this proposal "he did more constructive good to the class he represented than all his colleagues from Georgia in the 52nd Congress, with all those that have succeeded them, combined, have done." On 17 February 1893, Watson proposed an appropriation "for experimental free delivery in absolutely rural communities . . . amongst the farmers, in those neighborhoods where they do not get their mail more than once every two weeks, and where those deserving people have settled in communities one hundred years old and do not receive a newspaper that is not two weeks behind the times." Brewton writes that "there has never been an appropriaton made which yielded so great a return in general benefit to the nation as that for rural free delivery." Later, with the addition of parcel post, rural families could shop by mail. Large mail-order houses developed that catered to the needs of farmers.

In 1916, Watson reflected on his refusal to attend a caucus with the Democrats:

> A similar course was pursued by Senator Robert L. La Follette, three years ago, and the logic of his position was universally admitted . . . . But in my case it was different. A storm of abuse broke over my head, and I was held up to scorn, ridicule, hatred—called a Traitor, and accused of selling out to the Republicans.

While Watson was fighting for the people during his first session in Congress, the Establishment politicians were fighting Watson. When he returned to Georgia in 1892 to seek re-election, his congressional district had been gerrymandered to include two new counties. Watson christened his campaign a contest between "Democracy and Plutocracy," and ran as a Populist. General Gordon, a member of the Bourbon Triumvirate that Watson had opposed since his first days in politics, described him as "base," "false," "cowardly," and a "self-important little fly." Perhaps gadfly, in the Socratic sense, would have been a more apt designation.

Governor William J. Northern, a pawn of Eastern financial interests, was heard to say that, "Watson ought to be killed and

it ought to have been done long ago." An assasination attempt occurred while Watson was delivering a speech in a rural county. He later surveyed the election's outcome: "The counties voted for me as before; but, in the City of Augusta, votes were *repeated*, by gangs of hired negroes, until there were 18,000 votes in the boxes, when the whole list of voters numbered only 12,000. In this fraudulent way, I was driven out of Congress."

By the 1894 Congressional campaign, Grover Cleveland's reactionary financial policies and the Panic of 1893 had fanned the flames of agrarian rebellion. Watson charged that "The bankers opposed silver, and, for the purpose of having the law providing its issue repealed, they precipitated the panic." The "Alliance Democrats," like Livingston, had helped elect Cleveland President.

C. Vann Woodward, another Watson biographer, relates that his attempt to win back his seat "was not so much a campaign as a crusade, for the people did not listen so much as participate. The contemporary accounts of the enthusiasm evoked by the speeches of Watson border on the incredible." But enthusiasm could not triumph over what Woodward describes as "wholesale repeating, bribery, ballot-box stuffing, voting of minors, and intimidation." Bourbon tactics had been so blatantly unfair that a new election was held; but the same corrupt practices once again prevailed. Watson relates: "Three times I renewed the struggle; three times the same methods were used against me; and then I quit—broken in purse, in energy, in spirit, and almost in mind."

All of the Cleveland administration's groveling devotion to corporate and banking interests could not save it from another sort of insolvency—that of the political kind. Cleveland was not renominated for a second term. Instead, the 1896 Democratic National Convention chose William Jennings Bryan in an attempt to subvert the People's Party and turn the tide of Populism to its own advantage. The Vice-Presidential candidate, Arthur Sewall, was proof that the Democrats had adopted only the rhetoric of reform. The president of both a bank and trust, he was known for his exploitative labor policies.

The People's Party held its Convention in July. Senator Sam K. Jones, Chairman of the Democratic National Convention, attended in hope of persuading the Populists to nominate the Democratic ticket. Watson cautioned that "the party had proven its insincerity, and you will get nothing at its hands nor will your principles." Jones made representations to the Populist leaders that if they would endorse a Bryan-Watson candidacy, the Democrats would drop Sewell and do the same. The Populists did their part, but a few days after the Convention Jones wrote: "Mr. Sewall will, of course, remain on the ticket, and Mr. Watson can do what he likes."

Though Bryan was unable to free the nation from a "cross of gold," his campaign nailed the People's Party to one of silver. He virtually ignored the Populist principles verbalized in the 1889 St. Louis platform. Recognizing the propaganda value of simplistic appeals for free silver, he held this measure out as a cure for the country's ills.

Watson alerted the Populists to Bryan's silver demagoguery, writing that "certain wire-pullers in Washington were scheming to side-track the People's Party by having it surrender all of its platform excepting the Free Silver Plank." He proposed free silver as a remedy for the artificially high dollar, created by a corner on the gold market. However, he knew that any metal, including silver, could be similarly misused when given an inherent value.

Watson wrote: "To say that a Government promise or pledge is without value unless redeemed in Gold or Silver is a vicious heresy." Pointing out that "money is a mere product of agreement, convention, *law*," Watson attacked the "money-changers who use the *coin fetish* to hypnotize and plunder the nations of the earth." He added, "This tyranny of the banker is world-wide . . . . He first chains the nations to the word 'coin;'— then he gets his grip on the supply of 'coin;'—thus he holds the chain which fetters the globe."

Seeking to end the dominance of money over government, Watson proclaimed that "We stand for the principle that the government should create the money and distribute it." He warned that "in abdicating in favor of six thousand national bankers *the sovereign power of creating money*, the government has surrendered a power infinitely more precious than that of regulating foreign commerce."

Watson maintained that:

> There can never be too much Money in circulation as long as each dollar afloat is the result of that much produce. There will never be enough Money afloat as long as Commodities suffer because there is no Money to effect their ready exchange. A Currency System should be flexible; that is, the supply should increase as the demand increases and diminish as the demand ceases.

Such flexibility, he thought, would ensure stable prices.

"To smash the Money Trust, whose monstrous rapacity preys on every Nation," Watson counselled that

> *it is but necessary that the state shall assert its inherent power to create its own currency.* A dollar, whether in metal or paper, should be inscribed, "*This Dollar.*" That declaration, and the law which makes a dollar a legal tender for debts, are sufficient . . . . Absolutely nothing more is necessary to make that currency as good and as strong *as the Government which creates it.*

Although the Populists had been betrayed, Watson did his best to gain support for his party's ticket. He campaigned throughout the West, even in Bryan's home state of Nebraska; this brought Bryan his only victory there during his three unsuccessful bids for the Presidency. Yet Bryan refused to associate himself with Watson, and never joined him on the speaker's platform. Theodore Roosevelt commented, "Mr. Watson really ought to be the first man on the ticket, with Mr. Bryan second; for he is much the superior in boldness, in thorough-going acceptance of his principles according to their logical conclusions, and in sincerity of faith."

Looking back, Watson wrote that:

> the Democrats lost the race because they violated the St. Louis compact . . . . Had the Democratic leaders furnished . . . ever so small portion of the "rising above party," Bryan would have been elected. But they thought they could swallow us in the West, and crush us in the South, and they sacrificed Bryan in the effort to destroy Populism. They destroyed Populism as an organization.

Politically, Watson was ruined: He writes,

> Then you shut the world out of your life; buried yourself to all but the very few; called around you the companionship of Great Authors . . . . And then . . . you reached out for your pen and wrote. Ah, how your heart did forget its own troubles, *in that work*!

During 1889 his two-volume work, *The Story of France*, appeared. *The New York Evening Journal* called it "the best history ever written by an American." Watson published a biography of Napoleon in 1902, and one of Jefferson in 1903. The historical novel *Bethany: A Story of the Old South* appeared in 1904. That same year Watson was offered the editorship of William Randolph Hearst's *Morning American* on the condition that he move to New York. He chose to remain at Hickory Hill, his estate in Thomson, Georgia.

From Hickory Hill he embarked on a journalistic career that brought his political philosophy to the attention of the South and the entire nation. He founded the monthly *Watson's Magazine* in 1905, which was supplemented by the *Weekly Jeffersonian* in 1906. These publications were in the vanguard of the fight for Jeffersonian democracy. Watson contended that "all the upholders of class rule go back to Hamilton; all the upholders of a government of the people, by and for the people, get their creed, so far as this Republic is concerned, from Jefferson."

The March 1906 issue of *Watson's Magazine* thundered, "The Wall Street Railroad Kings rule and rob our state, and they do it by means of the men who control the machinery of the Democratic party. Hoke Smith is leading a great revolt against this Wall

Street domination, and he is doing it superbly. He is going to win, because the people know he is right." With these words Watson renewed the struggle against Georgia's aristocracy,which he had begun in 1882, by supporting a county railroad tax. Hoke Smith, an anticorporation lawyer, was his standard-bearer in the 1906 gubernatorial contest. Together they wrote a Democratic platform that included many Populist demands. An article by Herbert Quick in *The Reader* described it as "the most radical platform ever adopted, with perhaps one exception, by a state convention of either of the two great parties of these times." Watson dubbed Smith's opponent, Clark Howell, "the Corporation Candidate for Governor."

Regarding the constitutional amendment to disfranchise blacks that he and Smith proposed, Watson wrote, "The people of Georgia are hell-bent on smashing that Wall Street ring which rules and robs our state. *They are determined to put White Supremacy* INTO LAW, so that *they shall never again be vexed or intimidated by the scare of Negro domination.*" He noted that "In Georgia they do not dare to disfranchise him, because the men who control the Democratic machine in Georgia know that a majority of whites are against them. They need the negro to beat us with."

We have studied this problem from all points of view," Watson reasoned,

> and our matured conviction is that the only salvation for the negro in America is the acceptance, in good faith, of his legal rights *as the full measure of what is due him.* The sooner he abandons his attempt to share political power and privileges with the whites, the better for him . . . . We made civilization; the negro never made this, or any other. He has degraded every governmental system that he has been allowed to influence. As a duty to our forefathers, to ourselves, and our posterity, we must see to it that the negro makes no Haitian hell of the United States.

Smith was elected Governor by an overwhelming majority. The Bourbon dynasty had come to an end. Under Watson's guidance, Smith increased the railroad commission in size and importance. A special State's Attorney was appointed to prosecute corporations that violated its rulings. The small businessman and the farmer were no longer subjected to exhorbitant freight charges and other unfair practices. Steps were taken to end corporate bribes. Quick placed Smith "second only to La Follette, if second to any, as a trustbusting governor." The *Independent* ran an article entitled "Georgia's Example to the Nation."

Between 1906 and 1917 Watson was the dominant force in Georgia politics. By rallying his Populist followers behind him, he was able to exercise a decisive influence on many election cam-

paigns. Most successful gubernatorial candidates began their quest for office by seeking endorsement from the "Sage of Hickory Hill," as he was now called. Some were undone when they deviated from the Populist principles Watson was pledged to.

Since Watson was not himself a candidate for office, he was able to devote much time to his journalistic and literaty efforts. In his two periodicals, often referred to as the *Jeffersonians*, he continued to espouse the tenets of the Populist creed. Historical works still flowed from his pen. *Sketches from Roman History*, written from an agrarian perspective instead of the usual imperial one, appeared in 1908. *History of Southern Oratory* was published in 1909. A study of the battle of Waterloo followed in 1910. In 1912 came his biography of Jackson.

Watson's political philosophy was based on a committment to popular democracy and individual rights; on this basis he defended the states against the encroachments of the Federal Government. He warned: "The national character of the Federal Government becomes more pronounced, from year to year, and the *federated* idea grows more shadowy and feeble." He observed that "the Constitution was never even voted on 'by the people of the United States.' It was voted on by each state, acting seperately, in conventions and legislatures." He criticized men who were "lacking in faith in the people, and wanted the strongest possible concentration of power in the Federal Government." "The irony of fate has willed," wrote Watson, "that these tremendous advances in *centralization* have been made, mostly, at the instance of fanatical 'reformers,' who didn't care two buttons about the ultimate consequences to our mixed system of government."

Watson told a group of supporters:

> Under our present system of Government, through the representative, it is practically impossible for you to keep up with what is going on. The newspapers won't always tell you the truth . . . . To a large extent, our daily papers, especially, are controlled by corporate interests, who want legislation in their favor at your expense. There are some things you cannot get a chance to say in these newspapers. When they have got something especially unjust to put through, that is the very thing that is put through on the sly, and you will learn about it when it is too late.

Watson proposed the system of initiative, referendum, and recall as a remedy for legislative abuses. He reminded his listeners, "You exercise self-government through the men you choose to represent you. *They are not free agents.* They are not at liberty to follow their own personal inclinations, and give way to their personal prejudices." Reguarding the initiative, he said, "Send around a petition, demanding the passage of this, that and the other law, and see who will sign it. When that petition is signed by a

representative percentage of the people, then it ought to be made the duty of the legislature to put that law upon its passage." While discussing the referendum, he told his audience: "The legislature, the town council, the Congress, whenever it passes any kind of law, ought to refer it back to you, and ask you, Do you approve of this? You are the man who has got to obey it, and you are . . . the man who will have to pay these salaries and these taxes and conform to these regulations." Explaining the recall, he said, "You vote a judge in office, why shouldn't you have the right to vote him out of office, if you find he isn't the man you thought he was? Why keep him two years or four years? . . . . The same with Congressmen, Senators, Governors."

Watson opposed "Our American Judicial Oligarchy," writing that:

> The construction given to the general welfare clause, and the elastic quality of the implied powers (in the Constitution), have enabled the Government to adopt almost any sort of law the old lawyers on the Supreme Bench consider desirable. In the last resort, therefore, our laws depend upon the will of nine men chosen from one profession. These nine Supreme Legislators are usually the graduates of corporation law offices, foisted upon the people by partisan Presidents.
>
> Federal judges, who were corporation lawyers before they became Judges, are halting the sovereign States, reducing them to the station of mere private trespassers, and retaining them, by ever-ready injunction, from the exercise of governmental powers. Insolent corporations and usurping judiciary are moving step by step to a situation which a free people cannot endure.

Watson vigorously defended Populism against socialism in the *Jeffersonians*. He pointed out that "no Socialist experiment ever succeeded." "In spite of all the terrible abuses which prevail in Europe and America," he wrote, "*the non-capitalistic nations are the backward nations* . . . . Turkey, India and China cannot be called the victims of Capitalism; but we wouldn't exchange places and conditions with them. Capitalism itself, is enormously advantageous, when Special Privilege is driven out."

Concerning collective ownership, he wrote: "and it is because I have been a laborer, know the feelings of a laborer, and always expect to keep in touch and sympathy with the *real* laborer, that I stand so stoutly for the doctrine that the best reward and highest honor *Labor* can attain is the ownership and enjoyment of what it produces." He contrasted the Populist and socialist views of property: "The Jeffersonian Democrat says, '*Destroy Special Privilege;* make the laws conform to the rule of Equal Rights to all, and you will put it in the power of every industrious man to own his

home.' The Socialist says, 'Let Society own the homes, and let Society move the man about, from house to house, according to the pleasure of Society.'"

To the advocates of "Marxist democracy," Watson replied that "where Socialism prevails . . . they propose to give their men such a power over the lives and the labor of their fellow men as was never before proposed in the annals of the human race." Regarding socialist demands for reform, he argued: "The Discontent is warranted, but the remedy would substitute one slavery for another." "It can be shown," Watson wrote, "that all abuses at which the Socialist justly rails,—*grow out of violations of the principles of our system.* The true remedy therefore is to vigorously assert those principles."

Watson's mocking reply to egalitarianism was, "Even human nature is going to lose its meanness, for Socialism is going to make Man after *its* own image, to replace the Man that God made." Watson appraised human nature more realistically, writing that "No matter how equal material conditions might be made today by legislation, the inherent inequality in the capacities of men, physically, mentally, spiritually, would evolve differences tomorrow. There is no such thing as equality among men, and no law will ever give it to them."

Watson's remarks about socialism and immigration apply well to today's invading Third World legions:

> When a few million immigrants who haven't been here long enough to get the foreign twist out of their tongues, go to parading the streets, carrying the Red Flag . . . it is not a theory that makes them do it. No theory could convince the intelligence of these newly-arrived foreigners that they have any natural right to a share in the wealth they find here. They are governed by their passions, not their reason. It is cupidity that controls them, not altruism. They care no more about the fine-spun theories of Karl Marx than Alaric and Attila cared for the Justinian Code or the Nicene Creed.

Watson knew that the international banking establishment was as much a threat to American liberties as socialism. "Take the Rothschild family for an example," he wrote.

> Theirs is a typical case. Study it a moment. A small Jewish dealer and money-lender in Frankfort is chosen by a rascally ruler of one of the German States as a go-between in a villainous transaction whereby the little German ruler sells his subjects into military service to the King of England. These soldiers, who were bought, are known to history as the Hessians, and they fought against us in the Revolution. This was the beginning of the Rothschild fortune, the transaction having been very profitable to the Rothschild who managed it.

He continued,

> By the time Napoleon was overthrown at Waterloo, the Rothschild family had become so rich and strong that it spread over the European world. One member of the family took England, another France, another Austria, another Belgium, the parent house remaining in Germany, and to this day the Rothschild family is the dominant financial influence of the European world. In other words, by the power of money and the power of usury, they were able to make a partition of Europe and they are more truly the rulers of nations than are the Hapsburgs, the Hollenzollerns, the Romanoffs or any other one dynasty which wields the sceptre.

The Sage of Hickory Hill fought the tyranny of international bankers with the Jeffersonian creed:

> We Jeffersonians stand for the doctrine that the world's stock of wealth and of opportunity belongs to all mankind—to be won or lost on the basis of merit or demerit . . . . The holder of wealth has no right to legislate his fortune out of the reach of the risks and changes of legitimate business. He has no right to legislate his wealth into a mortgage upon the revenue of the government and the annual produce of all labor. He has no right to legislate special favors to himself, whereby enormous accumulations are held together, not by force of energy, industry and superior ability, but by reason of the special privileges and exemptions created by law.

In 1914, at the outbreak of World War I, Tom Watson took up the most important struggle of his political career. He did battle with the forces of internationalism and militarism that were to plunge our country into war and threaten its sovereignty afterwards with the League of Nations. Woodrow Wilson led these forces in an attempt to subjugate and plunder the American people.

Wilson was re-elected on the slogan, "He kept us out of War." Watson commented, "*What war*? Where did we have a chance to get in one? What did he do to keep us 'out'? . . . . *We had no cause to go in.*" During the election campaign Wilson had advocated military preparedness as the best guarantee of peace. Watson saw that Wilson's "preparedness" was only a guise for militarism and denounced "the insane notion that belligerence of attitude and conduct *lead to peace.*" He wrote that "*big armaments, instead of insuring* PEACE, *insure* WAR."

"Is it worth while to remind our public servants in Washington," Watson asked, "that this Constitution does not authorize or contemplate any other kind of war, except one for self-defense?" He scouted Wilson's "Hun" propaganda and advised nonintervention:

> It is absurd to say we are menaced by German danger. Germany cannot send troops here . . . . The Law of Nations and our own common sense, tell us that what England, France, and Germany do to each other is none of our business. It is not cause for us to send a million of our boys, to sacrifice their lives, so far from home.

Exposing what he termed Wilson's "sham neutrality," Watson said, "If we have loaned money to England and France to help make war, we have not been neutral. We are still doing it—the liberty Bonds prove it. J.P. Morgan cleaned up ninety million dollars as part of his share." He identified the real forces behind the interventionists: "'The world must be made safe for democracy,' said our sweetly sincere President; what he meant was, that the huge investment, which our Blood-Gorged Capitalists made in French, Italian, Russian and English *paper*, must be made safe. *Where Morgan's money went, your boys' must go*, ELSE MORGAN WILL LOSE HIS MONEY."

On 18 August 1917 Watson brought a test case before Federal Court, challenging the constitutionality of Wilson's Conscription Act. In his "Speech Against the Conscription Act," delivered during June of that year, he asked, "How does the Conscription Law, rushed upon the people by Congress, in April, 1917, accord with the time-honored principles of Magna Charta, as embodied in the Bill of Rights of every State, and as crystalized in the Constitution of the United States?" A candidate for Congress in Iowa was sentenced to ten years in the Federal Penitentary for publishing and distributing excerpts from Watson's address.

It seemed strange to Watson that a President so concerned with saving democracy abroad should pass the oppressive Espionage and Sedition Acts at home. He said, "On the pretext of waging war against Prussianism in Europe, the purpose of Prussianizing this country has been avowed in Congress, with brutal frankness, by a spokesman of the administration." He feared that the Republic would be "*transformed into a German military camp.*" "Already," he warned, "the Executive branch of Government has swallowed the Legislative, and the President has demanded-and secured more personal power than any Kaiser ever possessed."

Watson had scheduled an interstate convention in Macon, Georgia to discuss "the recent unconstitutional and revolutionary acts of Congress." Interference by the federal authorities and threats of military violence forced him to call it off. At the end of August, the *Jeffersonians* were banned under the Espionage Act and Watson's prediction of "prodigious sacrifices of treasure and blood" was soon to come true.

Personal tragedy was mingled with public ruin when Watson's remaining daughter died a week after the *Jeffersonians* were banned. Another daughter had been lost during infancy. During the U.S. war effort, reference was made to the "seditious utter-

ances" and "un-American writings" Watson had brought forth in his "disloyal, incendiary publications." His health worsened and he moved to Florida to seek relief. John Duram Watson, his last surviving child, was seized with convulsions and died there during a visit. Watson reflected: "Perhaps, you had come to realize that you were one of those men with whom Fortune deals grudgingly, one of those whom Hope deceives and Success laughs at; one of those who always has wind and wave against him, and who never by any sort of chance finds himself in league with luck."

Yet Watson would not give up. He returned to Georgia and renewed his fight against Wilson's policies. Soon after the Armistice he began publication of a new weekly paper, the *Columbia Sentinel*. Because he was still under a governmental ban, he had to post his newspaper from a neighboring town. Watson spoke from experience when he wrote:

> Not always is it easy to know the right,—very often is the road rough. Human praise can be won by shorter routes. Honor and riches are not always its rewards. Pleasanter days and calmer nights can be yours, if you float smoothly down the tide of policy,—steering deftly by the rules of the expedient.

During 1918, the Sage of Hickory Hill watched Senator Thomas W. Hardwick go down to defeat in his re-election campaign because of his opposition to the League of Nations. His challenger, who favored the League, had received Wilson's personal support. Watson was one of the League's greatest foes. Pointing out that George Washington "was a nationalist and not an internationalist; an American and not a cosmopolitan," he said,

> Let us stand by the wisdom of the farewell address. Let us stand by the words of wisdom. Let us be content with the prosperity which has been ours under the historic, purely American policies. Let us not embark at this late day, into European intrigue, dynastic quarrels, disputes between emperors and Kings, aristocracies and autocracies, involving our country in things which we do not understand and which we need not try to understand. Why should we? Let Europe and Japan tend to their own affairs, and let us attend to ours.

Intending to avenge Hardwick's loss, Watson announced his candidacy for the Senate in 1920. His enemies laughed that he had been "shelved so long he was dusty." The old Populist ran against two of the most powerful politicians in the state, Senator Hoke Smith, the incumbent, and Governor Hugh M. Dorsey. Smith had deserted the Populist principles that he had espoused during his days as a reform governor; having worked with Wilson in the Senate, he now refused to take a firm stand against the President's pet project, the League of Nations. Dorsey ran as an outspoken advocate of the League.

Watson traversed the state three times in an automobile, though suffering from asthma and bronchitis. Only one state newspaper, Hearst's *Atlanta Georgian and Sunday American*, gave him his support. Even the American Legion opposed him. And yet the people of Georgia were tired of war and internationalism. At one point during the campaign a crowd of 20,000 besieged an auditorium Watson was to speak at in Atlanta. By 5 o'clock in the afternoon the building contained 10,000 people, and the fire department announced that the rest would have to be turned away. Watson's supporters waited three hours to hear him speak, filling not only the seats but the floor, the aisles, even parts of the stage.

Watson made clear his complete rejection of the League of Nations:

> In the league, the great charter is engulfed, the sovereignty of the people disapears, and a universal monarchy is at last established. The council of the league will absorb within itself judicial power, legislative power, and executive power. It will be a supreme court of the world, a supreme legislature of the world, a supreme executive of the world. It will evolve its own army, its own treasury, its own system of finance, its own civil service. It will have in its hands both the purse and the sword, and nowhere on earth will there be a power to veto its measures or resist its usurpations.
>
> It pretends to assimilate the yellow race, the brown race, the black race, and the white race. It pretends to harmonize democracy with imperialism, the Kings with the republics. It pretends to reconcile the Buddhist with the Confucianist, the Mohammedan with the Christian . . . . It pretends to expect international melody out of 33 discordant national notes.
>
> If the real purpose is to create an international guaranty and collection agency for the great bankers and bondholders of indebted nations, then the League will be a success.
>
> The President (Wilson) admits that we will lose our independence in the league. Therefore he himself admits that he went to France and surrendered the very thing that our soldier boys fought and died to maintain . . . . What he has done is immensely more than equivalent to the destruction of the documents which contain the Declaration and of the Farewell Address. He has signed away independence itself; he has signed away the Americanism of the Farewell Address; he has surrendered what our forefathers gained under the shadow of a European crown.

The Treaty of Versailles also met with Watson's unyielding opposition. He asked, "What sort of peace was imposed upon the German *people*, whom Wilson said he 'loved'?" He pointed out that such treaties "will naturally arouse jealousy. Germany will not always be prostrate. Sixty-odd million people can not be kept down." He scoffed at those who claimed, because of a treaty, "that a millenium of brotherly love will ensue; that there will be no future wars, although humanity remains unchanged." He

could not understand how "experienced men of affairs, like the President of the United States, could believe for one minute that you can make any kind of agreement, signed up in any sort of way, which will banish war."

Watson won the senatorial contest. The popular vote he received was almost twice that of his opponents combined. His biographer (Brewton) describes the outcome as "the most signal victory ever recorded in Georgia politics." Hardwick had renewed his struggle against the League by entering the gubernatorial race, and was elected Governor.

The great Populist leader had been vindicated. After thirty years he was back in Washington. The Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations were never ratified, in part due to Watson's efforts. In the Senate he continued his struggle against internationalism by opposing the Four-Powers Treaty, which linked America with the imperialist interests of Europe. He cautioned that "the Republic can not be the partner of an imperialism, without a reaction coming from the imperialism affecting the democratic institutions and ideals in this country."

Watson fought the financial tyranny of the Federal Reserve Board, just as he had earlier done battle with the National Bank. Referring to a dangerous drop in farm prices, he charged that the Board had "destroyed the money, decreased the circulation, and brought on the panic which they called deflation." He asked President Harding to remove the five members of the Board and appoint others, contending that they were bankers in the service of Wall Street interests.

Senator Watson was tormented by chronic attacks of asthma during his term in the Sixty-Seventh Congress. His health compelled him to abandon the Washington hotel life and take up residence in Chevy Chase, Maryland. At one point he required the constant attention of a nurse for eight weeks. Despite such difficulties, he did hes best to attend to his senatorial duties.

On 17 September 1922 Watson suffered a painful asthma attack and the doctor insisted that he remain in bed for a week. However, he was determined to attend the closing of the second session of Congress on the twenty-second; there, he spoke out for a group of striking Pennsylvania coal miners who had recently been evicted from their homes. With his efforts in their behalf, Tom Watson had fought his last battle. He suffered a severe attack of asthma and bronchitis on the night of the twenty-fifth, and died the next morning—at the age of sixty-six. On September 28th 10,000 people attended his funeral at Hickory Hill.

The Sage of Hickory Hill still excites enmity from the foes of democracy and adherents to imperialism. A recent work sponsored by the Zionist Anti-[*sic*]Defamation League alleges that "Tom Watson wrote one of the dirtiest chapters of bigotry in the South.

Though twenty-nine speeches were given in his honor when Congress held memorial services during 1923, Senator Watson himself wrote the words that best serve as his epitaph:

> Let the tide ebb—it must be so; let the daylight fade, it must be so—but this much any poor mortal can do, and should do: Hold aloft, to the very last, the banner of your creed; fight for it as long as you can stand; and when you go down, let it be possible for you to say to those who love you: Lay a sword on my coffin; for I, also, was a soldier in the great struggle for humanity.

A Short Watson Bibliography

There are two biographies of Tom Watson: *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel*, by C. Vann Woodward, and *The Life of Thomas E. Watson*, by William W. Brewton. Both biographers give their subject a sympathetic treatment. Besides the historical works mentioned in the text, Watson wrote numerous books and pamphlets on political questions. *The People's Party Campaign Book* and the *Political and Economic Handbook* are systematic expositions of his political philosophy. *The Life and Speeches of Thomas E. Watson* contains his most famous pieces of oratory. *Sketches: Historical, Literary, Biographical, Economic, Etc.* and *Prose Miscellanies* are anthologies of articles from the *Jeffersonians*. Marxism and related creeds are subjected to a populist analysis in *Socialists and Socialism*. *Mr. Watson's Editorials on the War Issues* is a collection of his writings in opposition to World War I.

Three Assessments of the Infamy of December 7, 1941

PERCY L. GREAVES, Jr.

AT DAWN WE SLEPT: THE UNTOLD STORY OF PEARL HARBOR by Gordon W. Prange, in collaboration with Donald M. Goldstein and Katherine V. Dillon, McGraw Hill, 889pp, $22.95.

THE PACIFIC WAR, by John Costello, Rawson Wade, 742pp, $24.00.

INFAMY, by John Toland, Doubleday, 366pp, $17.95.

The Pearl Harbor disaster marks much more than the worst naval, military and diplomatic defeats in American history. It represents the culmination of a half century movement to discard the philosophy of our Founding Fathers—a philosophy that had attracted millions of immigrants to our shores in their pursuit of personal prosperity in the land of the free and of limited government. Pearl Harbor, and its aftermath, dropped a curtain over the economic failures of the New Deal policies of ever-increasing political spending and a politically controlled economy in an attempt to solve the government-created problems of inflation and mass unemployment. It also launched the full flowering of a new form of imperialism, whereby it is assumed that the President of the United States is not only the chief policeman of the world, but also the chief dispenser of largess at home and abroad.

Dates not in quotations are given in the European or American-military style, in accordance with *The JHR* style. —*P.L.G.*

It has long been this reviewer's contention that the true story of Pearl Harbor is too complex, interwoven and unbelievable to be presented in a single volume. Nevertheless, three brave men have recently attempted to do so. Their books all read well. An uninformed reader of any one might well think that book very informative. The reader of all three is more likely to be confused than enlightened.

The Prange book is a full-fledged one-sided defense of the position to which the Roosevelt adulators have been driven by the revelations of facts long hidden from the public. Oddly, the authors of its Introduction hope "it raises more questions than it provides answers." This it does. The Costello book is the work of a truth-seeking Englishman with a bias that it was our duty to save England and the world from the scourge of Hitler. Much of the book's "significant new evidence," [1] though it may be interesting and informative to many, can be found buried in material made public in 1945 and 1946. The Toland book is a far from complete story. However, it is the one that provides us with the most new, valuable and interesting information on what contributed to this highly important disaster and the attempts made to cover up the truth. Its many contributions will have to be taken into consideration by all future historians of this event.

At Dawn We Slept

Prange died in May 1980, so two of his former students—Donald L. Goldstein and Katherine V. Dillon—have edited his massive manuscript into its published form. They claim he tried "to be as objective as humanly possible." [2] Possibly so, if one accepts the "new imperialism" as a basis for weighing what he found. However, if one accepts the constitutional concepts of our Founding Fathers, it becomes difficult to believe that "Washington had very little practical option." [3] Even if one accepts the "new imperialism" philosophy that the problems of the Far East were the problems of the United States in general and our President in particular, Prange, like many others, completely ignores the fact that the basic controversy in that area was between the expansionist policies of the communist-minded Soviet Union and the largely western-oriented Japan in need of raw materials and markets for her finished goods.

Prange is silent on the Soviet attempts to disrupt Japan's commercial and industrial developments on the mainland. Yet, it was the "commies" and the lack of local government protection that created "incidents" which led to Japan's questionable military operations on the mainland. President Roosevelt sided with a weak Chinese government which could not control the terroristic devastations of either the "war lords" or the "commie" trouble

makers, much less maintain peace in the market place. Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) severed our trade treaty with Japan in the summer of 1940. He, thus, consciously or unconsciously, took the side of the Soviet Union in the Far East squabble. After Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, FDR considered the Soviets our allies and provided them Lend-Lease aid. At the same time meaningful negotiations with the Japanese ceased, as FDR drew an even tighter noose around Japan's economic neck. Prange's objectivism consists in believing Roosevelt had no choice and that while he may have made some small human errors in details, his overall policies were heroic. He does, on occasion, admit there were some peace-minded people in Japan, but the war-minded military expansionists won out. That this may have been the result of FDR's personal anti-Japanese policies is not one of Prange's positions.

When it gets to the investigations, we learn that "Stimson's suggestion" of Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts "was a good choice to direct the investigation" [4] that cleared FDR, Stimson, Marshall et al of any responsibilities, while placing full blame on the Hawaiian commanders, Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and General Walter C. Short. Prange neglects to state that Roberts had been an interventionist advocate before Pearl Harbor. He, Prange, tells us the Hart Inquiry produced "valuable material," [5] but he fails to cite any, preferring the later, refreshed testimony that attempts to refute the earlier evidence. Forced to admit that under oath neither General George Catlett Marshall nor Admiral Harold R. Stark could recall the most important days and events in their lives, he takes refuge in "witnesses like Stark and Marshall who frankly admit that they do not know or remember everything can be more credible than those who testify in assured detail to matters of which they have no direct knowledge." [6] That should take care of those who knew of and acted on the receipt of the still missing "winds execute" message that indicated war with the United States and Britain. When Senator Homer Ferguson's vigorous questioning of Marshall during the Congressional investigation placed a number of damaging facts in the record, we read that he "kept Marshall on the stand for an incredible nine and a half hours. His first session . . . covered a potpourri of subjects which we need not examine." [7]

While he does admit the War and Navy Departments failed to send vital information they had to the Pearl Harbor commanders, it would take another book of 800 pages to balance, correct and refute the one-sided presentation of the book's selected "facts" and deductions. However, as one the book calls a "gifted, convinced revisionist," [8] this reviewer must comment on the final section of the book that ends with this sentence:

> But in a thorough search of more than thirty years, including all publications released up to May 1, 1981 we have not discovered one document or one word of sworn testimony that substantiates the revisionist position on Roosevelt and Pearl Harbor.[9]

The section starts off by admitting that some of the conclusions of "the more reasonable revisionists" are "arguable."[10] Then he tells us:

> According to Beard, the President was a warmonger who deceived the American people, violated his antiwar campaign pledge of 1940, and maneuvered the Japanese into firing the first shot.[11]

Part of his rebuttal reads:

> Percy L. Greaves, Jr., too, conceded, "Washington did not know, or at least no evidence has been adduced that Washington knew, precisely, that the attack would fall on Pearl Harbor although they (sic) had good reason to expect that it might."[12]

That has been my position since 1946 and still is. However, Prange neglects three now well established facts: (1) That FDR was re-elected in 1940 with the help of public promises that we were not going to fight in any foreign wars, while he was secretly promising aid to the British once the election was won; (2) That FDR precipitated the attack with an ill-considered ultimatum he knew Japan could not accept; and (3) That FDR told his War Cabinet on 25 November 1941, that an attack could be expected as soon as next Monday. Unfortunately, FDR's attention was on the Japanese convoys moving south toward Thailand and Malaya. His chief worry in late 1941 was whether Congress and the country would back him up in keeping his secret unconstitutional promises to Britain that we would join the war if the Japanese, as they drove for the vitally needed oil we would not let them buy, passed us by and attacked only British or Dutch territory.

Prange claims that when William Henry Chamberlin states the Japanese task force was "under the command of Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto," he made "a mistake . . . the sort of factual error that casts doubt upon a (sic) historian's credibility."[13] Actually, the task force was operating under the orders of Admiral Yamamoto, who sent the final attack orders from his headquarters in Japan.

That was a little one. Now for a big one:

> Greaves asserted, "Early in 1941 administration officials reached a secret agreement with British and Dutch officials, which committed us to go to war against Japan if Japanese forces crossed a certain line." It so happened that representatives of the U. S. and British Army and Navy staffs held discussions in Washington from January 29 to March 27, 1941. These discussions culminated in a secret military agreement (ABC-1 of March 1941). Roosevelt did not approve ABC-1 . . . . Doubtless this is the "secret agreement" to which Greaves referred. However, both Marshall and

> Stark withheld approval because, among other reasons, ABC contained "political matters" and the proposals set forth did not constitute "a practical operating plan." These plans and discussions did not commit the United States politically to go to war with Japan, Germany, or both; they outlined the military strategy to be followed if the country joined the conflict. [14]

While only Congress can constitutionally declare war, this "secret agreement" by "administration officials" did commit "us to go to war against Japan if Japanese forces crossed a certain line." A statement signed by the Secretary of the Joint Board was introduced into the hearings, stating that the President had "familiarized himself" with the agreement, but "he would not approve the report at this time." [15]

Unfortunately, the original copy, signed by the "administration officials" could not be located. However, on 3 April 1941, Stark sent each of the Commanders in Chief of the three United States fleets "two copies of the Report (Short title ABC-1)." His official letter stated:

> This Report has been approved by the Chief of Staff of the Army and by myself and, at an appropriate time is expected to receive the approval of the President . . . . The basic idea of the United States-British plan is that the United States will draw forces from the Pacific Fleet to reenforce the Atlantic Fleet, and that the British will, if necessary, transfer naval forces to the Far East to attempt to hold the Japanese north of the Malay Barrier . . . . The question of our entry into the war now seems to be *when* and not *whether*.[16]

This 3 April letter, just quoted, was distributed to the Congressional Committee members as part of Exhibit #106. However, the printed record omitted it from that exhibit. Perhaps it was because of Stark's next letter to Kimmel, dated 4 April, which said:

> Yesterday, I sent an official letter to you . . . . Spent over three hours with him [the President] day before yesterday and another hour yesterday. My official letter on the staff conversations had some thoughts in it as a result of that Conference. I may tell you and Hart and King, in the strictest confidence and I mean by that nobody but you and Hart and King, that I read to the President the official secret letter which I mailed you three yesterday and received his general assent to it. . . . I am also enclosing a memorandum, which I regard as vitally secret and which I trust you will burn as soon as you have read it, covering the President's talk with Ghormley and me yesterday. [17]

Admiral Robert Lee Ghormley was the Navy's representative to the British government.

Stark's Chief of War Plans, Admiral Richmond Kelly Turner, testified before the Hart Inquiry:

> WPL-46; Rainbow 5, it was known as. That war plan was a joint plan between the Army and the Navy. It had its basis in an international agreement with the British Army, Navy and Air Force . . . It was a worldwide agreement . . . . On the conclusion of that agreement with the British, the WPL-46 was prepared after a great many talks with the Army and was approved by the Joint Board, the Secretaries of War and Navy, and by the President. The Navy issued their form of that war plan in May of 1941.[18]

He also testified that:

> In May of 1941, decision was reached jointly with the British Government to occupy the Azores. The force which was withdrawn from the Pacific at that time . . . . That project was abandoned and the occupation of Iceland by American troops was substituted.[19]

Stark's Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll later told the Hart Inquiry:

> The transfer of ships from the Pacific to the Atlantic was in accordance with WPL-46, which, in turn, was based on the U.S.-British conversations which culminated in the plan known as "ABC-1."[20]

The Navy Court of Inquiry asked Stark, "Who approved the Joint Army and Navy Basic War Plan Rainbow 5?" He replied, "It was approved by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the President."[21]

When Stark appeared before the Congressional Committee, his distributed statement read, "Based on the understandings arrived at in ABC-1, the Army and the Navy developed a Joint Basic War Plan known as Rainbow No. 5, which was approved by the Secretaries of War and the Navy ~~and by the President.~~" In reading his statement, he said he had crossed out the words "and by the President" because he was told to do so when he submitted the statement to the Navy Department the day before. His reason for doing so, which this reviewer heard him state, has been omitted from the printed record.[22]

General L.T. Gerow, Chief of Army War Plans, told the Roberts Commission, "the Joint Army and Navy Basic War Plan—Rainbow No. 5 was approved by the President, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in May 1941."[23]

In a Joint Memorandum for the President dated 5 November 1941, Marshall and Stark concluded:

> The basic military policies and strategy agreed to in the United States-British Staff conversations remain sound . . . . Military action against Japan should be undertaken only in one or more of the following contingencies:
>
> (1) A direct act of war by Japanese armed forces against the territory or mandated territory of the United States, the British Commonwealth, or the Netherlands East Indies;
>
> (2) The movement of Japanese forces into Thailand to the west of 100° East or south of 10° North; or into Portugese Timor, New Caledonia, or the Loyalty Islands.[24]

The SECRET Rainbow 5 states under "PHASE 1—Initial tasks—Japan not in the war. . . . Protect the territory and communications of the associated powers."[25] The Associated Powers were understood to be the United States, Netherlands East Indies and the British Commonwealth, including Australia, New Zealand and India.

The reader can make his or her own decision as to whether or not there was a "secret agreement" in force in the spring of 1941, and whether "both Marshall and Stark withheld approval."

Revisionists, being human, have made mistakes. Carried away emotionally by the blatant cover up propaganda of the "court historians," they have on occasion let some of their deductions exceed the provable facts. This reviewer has opposed such claims and has constantly maintained that, as incomplete as the record is, the known facts prove that FDR deceived the American public and that his aides lied time and time again in an effort to cover up the truth. General Sherman Miles admitted in an affidavit that he was ordered by Marshall to commit perjury by refusing to tell the full truth.[26]

So much for the Prange effort, which certainly "raises more questions than it provides answers."[27]

The Pacific War

John Costello's book is an unfortunate one. He is an Englishman, too young to have any mature recollections of the times and conditions existing in Asia and this country in the years and crucial months preceding the Pearl Harbor disaster. Unlike Prange, he was unable to know, observe or interview any of the major participants. He was thus dependent on the written records he had time to examine in the short time he devoted to the subject. Although he knew of the Joint Congressional Committee hearings, which he mistakenly refers to as the Senate hearings, his lack of familiarity with the contents of the some 44 volumes that were part of its record leaves much to be desired. On the subject of Pearl Harbor, he is an amateur, competing in the big leagues.

As most histories are written from the viewpoint of the victors, Costello, who matured in the post World War II era, has read only the generally accepted establishment view that it was right and proper for the United States to interfere in the Far East quarrels—quarrels that President Hoover, along with most Americans of his era and before, felt were matters about which the United States would not go to war. This new form of noblesse oblige imperialism is probably easier for an Englishman to accept than for a traditional American. Costello not only accepts it, but agrees with the pre-Pearl Harbor Roosevelt position that Japan was guilty of one-sided "aggression in China,"[28] and that "Japan was progressing toward a totalitarian Fascist state."[29]

He gives little thought to the possibility that it was Communist infiltration from Siberia that was the underlying cause behind most of the early incidents that led to the Japanese military expedition. It may have been all right in 1901 for Japan to join with the United States, Britain, France, Germany and Russia in protecting her nationals in China. But somehow or other Japan was no longer entitled to protect her nationals or her commercial and industrial interests when what passed for the Chinese government could not maintain law and order. The trouble makers were never the "commies." It was "the Japanese, who engineered 'incidents'."[30] So economic measures to strangulate Japan were desirable even though they led inevitably to a war to restrain Japan and make Asia safe for communist exploitation.

For the serious student, the book is a horror. Costello's editors certainly let him down. The author apparently felt that only quotations needed to be documented. Consequently, many important statements are unsupported. Much worse is the fact that the documentation is all too often in error. Quotations are occasionally mangled or so edited as to modify the meaning of a longer quotation. Some of the documentation errors are to the wrong pages. Others are to the wrong books. Some are ludicrous, as references to pages 440 and 944 in a book that has only 266 pages. Too many are to an "op.cit." many pages away; at least one is to a book not included in a rather skimpy bibliography for this subject.[31]

The book states that a Navy witness, who tried to send an alert to Pearl Harbor, "testified, the War Plans Division had 'so amended the dispatch as to make it worthless'."[32] The record does not show that the witness ever made such a statement. The page cited indicates the witness took the drafted message to the Chief of War Plans who "made a number of corrections in it, striking out all except the information parts of it, more or less." The witness was told, "If you want to send it, you either send it the way I corrected it, or take it back to Wilkinson [his superior] and we will argue about it."[33] The revised draft was left with Wilkinson, but never sent. A reading of the full testimony of the witness's two appearances fails to reveal the words Costello places in quotation marks.

The Japanese Honolulu to Tokyo 6 December message ended, "the heavy cruisers and airplane carriers have all left. It appears that no air reconnaissance is being conducted by the fleet air arm."[34] This appears in the book as, "ALL CARRIERS AND HEAVY CRUISERS ARE AT SEA. NO SPECIAL REPORTS ON THE FLEET OAHU IS QUIET . . . ."[35] Why the author should take such liberties is hard to understand.

He was also unaware of why there was a delay in translating this "bomb plot" series. The message cited was read after the attack, but earlier ones were read in Washington before the attack after receipt from Hawaii by airmail. Airmail was only twice

a week then. Contrary to Costello's belief, Hawaii could have read the series promptly if Washington had alerted them. However, the Hawaii code experts had been ordered to devote all their energies to breaking the Japanese Naval code. So such messages in the minor consular code were forwarded to Washington for decoding. None of this vital information was ever sent to Hawaii.

There are countless factual errors of differing importance, but not the kind a careful historian would permit to appear in print. We read on one page page about "the fall of Paris on July 18." On the next page we read, "on June 21, the day before Germany and France signed their armistice." Paris fell on 22 June.

The book reads: "Konoye on November 11 proclaimed 'a new order in East Asia' to save China from her traditional fate as the 'victim of the imperialistic ambitions of the occidental powers'." [37] For his source he cites another book. Actually, the date of Konoye's radio speech was eight days earlier, 3 November, 1938. The translation in the official U.S. State Department volume does not include the words in the inner quotes. It does state:

> The Chiang Kai-shek administration has practically been reduced to a mere local regime . . . . What Japan sincerely desires is the development and not the ruin of China. It is China's cooperation and not conquest that Japan sincerely desires. Japan desires to build up a stabilized Far East by cooperating with the Chinese people who have awakened to the need of self-determination as an Oriental race . . . . It goes without saying that Japan will not exclude cooperation of foreign Powers. Neither she intends to damage the legitimate rights of the third Powers in China . . . . The world knows that Japan is earnestly determined to fight it out with communism. What the Comintern intends to do is bolshevisation of the Far East and disturbance of world peace. Japan expects to suppress in a drastic manner the sources of the evils of bolshevisation and their subversive activities.[38]

One may legitimately doubt the sincerity of any diplomat, but that is no reason to misrepresent and misquote his actual words.

On page 90 we read that Hitler invaded the Soviet Union on "July 22, 1941." On the next page we read, "The day before Operation Barbarosa . . . June 21." That was plain carlessness. But what about his crediting Lieutenant Commander A. D. Kramer with Captain L. F. Safford's office,[39] or having Kimmel "sent out in February 1941,"[40] when he went out with the Fleet almost a year earlier and merely assumed the top command on 1 February? Costello confuses the "winds code" and "winds execute" messages,[41] as well as FDR's full Cabinet and War Cabinet,[42] which included the Secretaries of War, Navy and State, along with the Chief of Staff and Chief of Naval Operations. He has FDR making a statement to his wife, Eleanor, that his source states was made to a judge in his wife's presence.[43] It was about FDR's face-saving message sent early in the evening of

6 December to the Japanese Emperor.[44] This was after he knew Japan's reply was in—a reply that he had known since 22 November meant "things are automatically going to happen"[45] and which, when he saw 13 of its 14 parts, caused him to say, "This means war."[46]

Costello even has Marshall out horseback riding when his 7 December duty officer, in a statement written on 8 June 1942, stated Marshall "arrived at the office at about 10:00 o'clock or shortly thereafter and had a series of conferences with staff officers from G-2 and the War Plans Division."[47]

Costello is totally confused about the controversial message of 27 November to General Short signed "Marshall." Actually, Marshall was out of town that day and had nothing to do with it. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, whom Costello calls Secretary of the Navy on page 83 and Secretary of War on page 85, sent that message, which was primarily a copy of the one sent to General Douglas MacArthur in the Philippine Islands. The messages said, "You are directed to undertake such reconnaissance and other measures as you deem necessary." Generals Short and MacArthur were both ordered to "report measures taken."[48] Stimson was unfamiliar with the situation in Hawaii. Both Marshall and Short knew, if Stimson did not, that there were no Army planes available in Hawaii for long distance reconnaissance. Most of Hawaii's B-17s had been sent on to the Philippines.

Costello, like many others, is bothered by the sudden 26 November decision to jettison the proposed United States "*modus vivendi*" as an answer to a Japanese proposed "*modus vivendi.*" It was designed to gain a delay of three months on the decision for war. While China objected furiously, it had been approved by the War Cabinet and the governments of Britain, Netherlands and Australia. On 26 November, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau called on FDR as he received his breakfast in bed. Costello tells us: "Plainly Roosevelt had just received some news which had shaken him because 'He had not touched his coffee'."[49] From this non sequitur, he jumps to the conclusion "that whatever war warning the President received on the morning of November 26th, it almost certainly came from Churchill." He then reasons the alleged war warning must have come "through *an entirely confidential channel* . . . . the likely source and channel is to be found in the account of William Stephenson," the British agent in New York whose duty was to get the United States into the war with FDR's secret help. He believes the "go-between" was FDR's son, James.[50]

While Costello states "there are *no* indications in the published accounts," he presumes "there is good reason" to believe that "still sealed" papers "must cast doubt on Stimson's account as well as the official version of why the United States so dramatic-

ally and unexpectedly reversed its policy toward Japan on the morning of November 26, 1941 . . . .That some war warning *was* received in the White House that day was certainly believed by Admiral Kimmel . . . . he certainly tried to establish the existence of such a warning." As justification for this, he cites a question "Kimmel asked Stark" during the Navy Court of Inquiry. Actually, Kimmel asked the question during a cross examination of Admiral R. E. Schuirmann, the Navy's liaison with the State Department. Kimmel asked, "Do you recall whether on or about 26 November you received information from the Office of Naval Intelligence that they had specific evidence of Japan's intention to wage war against both Britain and the United States?"[51] Schuirmann refused to answer, claiming "his privilege against revealing state secrets." The Judge Advocate sustained the objection as "beyond the scope of direct examination."[52]

Kimmel asked a series of questions "to ascertain the specific information which he was being denied."[53] They all referred to intercepts of Japanese messages which were still classified "Top Secret." Schuirmann refused to answer any of the questions Kimmel asked and the Court upheld Schuirmann's objections. What Costello did not know was that these questions were based on a statement Captain L. F. Safford had prepared from memory, when the intercepts were missing from the files, for his testimony before the Hart Inquiry.[54] He was undoubtedly recalling a Hanoi-Tokyo Purple intercept translated on 26 November that said:

> (Strictly Secret)
> We are advised by the military that we are to have a reply from the United States on the 25th. If this is true, no doubt the Cabinet will make a decision between peace and war within the next day or so . . . . Should, however, the negotiations not end in a success, since practically all preparations for the campaign have been completed, our forces shall be able to move within the day."[55]

Another fact Costello did not seem to know was why Morgenthau was calling on FDR before breakfast on 26 November. Chaing Kai-shek was not the only one opposed to the "*modus vivendi*." The communists were also active opponents. Chiang's American adviser was no other than Owen Lattimore. Lattimore sent a key cable to Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant to FDR, which said in part:

> You should urgently advise the President of the Generalissimo's strong reaction. I have never seen him really agitated before . . . . Any "*modus vivendi*" . . . would be disastrous to Chinese belief in America . . . . The Generalissimo has deep confidence in the President's fidelity to his consistent policy but I must warn you that even the Generalissimo questions his ability to hold the situation together if the Chinese national trust in America is undermined.[56]

Apparently Lattimore was also helpful with the cables that bombarded many top Administration officials as well as one that caused Churchill to send FDR a cable received at 6 a.m. 26 November stating:

> It is for you to handle this business and we certainly do not want an additional war. There is only one point that disquiets us. What about Chiang Kai Shek? Is he not having a very thin diet? Our anxiety is about China. If they collapse our joint dangers would enormously increase. We are sure that the regard of the United States for the Chinese cause will govern your action. We feel that the Japanese are most unsure of themselves. [57]

Morgenthau was one of the recipients of the loud cries from Chungking on 25 November. The first thing on the morning of the 26th, the Chinese Ambassador called on Morgenthau's aide, Harry Dexter White, at the Treasury. White went to Morgenthau who left immediately for the White House to persuade FDR to receive the Chinese Ambassador and oppose the "*modus vivendi*."[58] FDR did so and Hull was ordered to send an ultimatum everyone knew Japan could not accept.

Congressional committees have found that Lattimore, Currie and White were closely tied in with Communist interests in Washington. Regarding Costello's speculation that there was another message from Churchill, it should be mentioned that the "neutral" FDR established the first "hotline" telephone with Churchill in May 1940.[59] While this "confidential channel" undoubtedly explains why some FDR replies to Churchill requests were not in the files, it is extremely doubtful that FDR was shaken by a "war warning" phone call from Churchill on 26 November.

Costello writes much of "new evidence." He states "no detailed plan of the Pearl Harbor Attack . . . survived the Japanese destruction program at the end of the war."[60] Actually, on 29 November 1945, MacArthur sent the Congressional Committee a copy of the plan and it was printed in 1946 as Exhibit No. 8-B.[61] Costello was intrigued to find "in the recently declassified records, an almost complete translation of Yamamoto's first operation order . . . : COMBINED FLEET TOP SECRET OPERATION ORDER 1."[62] This was part of the Committee's Exhibit No. 8-D.

Costello informs us, "It is now possible to conclude, with some certainty, that it was not Stimson's report that proved crucial. That 'missing' document has been recovered from the recently declassified Confidential File of the Secretary of War."[63] Bravo! That "missing" document was printed in 1946 as Exhibit No. 98 of the Congressional Hearings.[64]

Costello shows his evident distaste for "isolationists," "the isolationist press," "isolationist pressures," "the isolationist-inspired," "the 'professional pacifists'" as well as for his finding that an "isolation-dominated Capitol Hill" passed the Neutrality

Act "to keep the United States in strict international purdah." [65] Nevertheless, he does realize that FDR and Churchill, off Argentina in August 1941, secretly agreed to pursue parallel action against Japan and publicly signed the Atlantic Charter. "This proclaimed Anglo-Saxon unity to uphold Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, but in spite of great press fanfares it was to leave unmoved the 75 percent of Americans who still opposed going to war against Germany." [66]

Despite the many shortcomings, the book does contain a number of statements with which more Americans should be made familiar. He tells us that "the Soviet Union sent arms to Mao Tse-Tung's guerrilla army" in China and forced Japan to choose either to accept a "stalemate or commit more forces to a military campaign to subdue the rest of China."[67] In commenting on the "American isolationists" and their imagined machinations with the Axis, he informs us that "British undercover agents,with the unofficial blessing of the White House, were operating along with the FBI to expose such conspiracies at the risk of violating American constitutional rights."[68]

He concludes that "the two '*modus vivendi*' positions were not irreconcilably apart. Significantly, the United States appeared ready to buy three more months of peace in the Pacific with a limited relaxation of the embargo and some encouragement on the Chinese to negotiate with Japan."[69] He also quotes Churchill's "November 23, 1941 minute to Anthony Eden" in which he said, "I should feel pleased if I read that an American-Japanese agreement had been made by which we were able to be no worse off three months hence in the Far East than we are now."[70]

He also reminds us that our veteran Ambassador to Japan warned FDR that the imposition of embargoes "could lead to open conflict." He even states that both FDR and Hull "had been repeatedly warned by Ambassador Joseph Grew that Japan was being pushed into a diplomatic impasse from which war was the only exit."[71]

While we can disagree that his "new evidence" adds much, some of his conclusions are certainly acceptable deductions from the known facts. For example:

> There is every indication that a month before the attack on Pearl Harbor, it was the United States that had decided to bring about the rupture of discussions and was about to prepare for the worst. There is now evidence for believing that President Roosevelt was not only expecting war but possibly knew exactly when it would break out. Clues . . . on both sides of the Atlantic . . . suggest that after the third week in November 1941 the British and American governments had not only decided that war with Japan was inevitable—but they knew the attack would hit Malaya and the Philippines. [72]
>
> According to a confidential British Foreign Office report 'the Pres-

> ident and Mr. Hull were . . . fully conscious of what they were doing.'. . . . Whether such an accommodation [the *modus vivendi*] would have worked out in practice is less important than the fact that it was the United States which decided to abandon the *modus vivendi*—thereby making a Pacific war inevitable . . . . In the light of subsequent events, this decision proved to have been one of the most momentous in America's history.[73]

To which we say, "Amen."

Infamy

The Toland book is a delight to read as well as the most informative of the three. He has pursued a number of previously unexplored leads with numerous interviews and a wide reading of pertinent sources. As a result, he has uncovered or confirmed much that is helpful in putting the complex Pearl Harbor jigsaw puzzle together. The book is not perfect or all inclusive, but it is probably the best volume on the subject to date.

While the book deals primarily with the attempted cover ups after the war, he does weave in many of the little-known important events and decisions that led up to the attack. Unfortunately, he does not develop fully the significance of his two major contributions—the Tyler Kent affair and the Stahlman letter.

His story of the Tyler Kent affair is the most revealing that this reviewer has seen in print. This case of the May 1940 British arrest and detainment, for the duration of the war, of an American code clerk with diplomatic privileges is one of the blackest marks on the record of the Roosevelt Administration. While Kent undoubtedly violated American law and regulations, there was no valid reason for the British to detain him. The waiver of his immunity certainly had to have the highest approval. If he had been expelled from England and tried by an American court, it would certainly have changed the course of history. Toland does not go into this aspect. However, if Kent had revealed the contents of the damaging FDR-Winston Churchill documents to Burton K. Wheeler of the U.S. Senate, rather than Captain A. H. M. Ramsey, of the British Parliament, this reviewer doubts that FDR would have obtained the 1940 Democratic Party nomination, much less a third term election. Without Roosevelt in the White House, it is difficult to imagine Pearl Harbor.

A few pages before the book's end, buried at the end of a paragraph, we read:

> One of Knox's close friends, James G. Stahlman, wrote Admiral Kemp Tolley in 1973 that Knox told him that he, Stimson, Marshall, Stark and Harry Hopkins had spent most of the night of December 6 at the White House with the President: All were waiting for what they knew was coming: an attack on Pearl Harbor.[74]

Toland continues, "The incredulities continued," but makes no further comment on this astounding bit of information. Mr.

Stahlman was not just a close friend of Knox. He was a well known publisher and a man of substance—a veteran of World War I and the President of the American Newspaper Publishers Association 1937-39 who served in Washington during World War II as a Captain in the U.S. Naval Reserve. His letter is prime evidence. While we can agree that these men were expecting some kind of an attack, there is still no documented evidence that they were thinking of Pearl Harbor. All available records indicate their attention was on the Japanese convoys going south. This is confirmed by Knox's spontaneous "My God, this can't be true! This must mean the Philippines," when informed of the attack.[75] The chief concern was whether we would be included in the attack and, if not, whether Congress and the country would endorse their secret desires, if not promise, to join in the defense of British and Dutch territory.

Think what this Stahlman letter means. It is certainly further proof that the testimonies of Stimson, Marshall and Stark are worthless. They could not recall. It also helps explain why so many of their underlings changed their earlier sworn testimony in order to conform with the desires of their superiors. We should no longer be surprised at the great lengths other "responsible" persons went to suppress the truth. After all, the record shows that Marshall ordered one of his aides to commit perjury before the Army Pearl Harbor Board. If one, were there not others?[76]

Toland does provide a large number of instances in which efforts were made to twist or suppress the truth. He adds much to the story of Marshall's successful attempt to keep Thomas Dewey from mentioning in the 1944 Presidential campaign the pre-Pearl Harbor reading of Japanese codes. This was probably justified, as we were reading all Berlin-Tokyo diplomatic messages sent in the same system. However, few of the other attempts could be justified, particularly after the end of the war.

While there has been prior mention of the case of Chief Warrant Officer Ralph T. Briggs, Toland deserves great credit for breaking the full story. In doing so, he should end at last all doubt about the receipt of Tokyo's "winds execute" message. Tokyo set up a "winds code" on 19 November. It was a false weather message designed to inform Japan's consular and diplomatic representatives on the outbreak of war after they had destroyed their code books and machines. The code destruction orders went out on 1 and 2 December. So both Japanese and American radio stations were monitoring all weather broadcasts for the key words. Early testimony indicated that several persons had seen the "execute" of the "winds code" message and a number of others testified they had been informed of its reception. The cover-up forces then tried to dispel the idea that this clear warning of war, or at least of the breaking of relations, with Britain and the United States, was ever received. This had three

purposes: (1) It would water down or divert attention from the clear warnings that war was imminent after our 26 November ultimatum to Japan; (2) It would help excuse the failure to send more information to the Pearl Harbor commanders; and (3) It would cast doubt on the testimony of those few witnesses who were trying to tell the truth.

Toland informs us of some of the methods used to suppress the truth. Secretary Knox had promised Kimmel permission to have an aide search the files for pertinent documents.[77] One day the Acting Navy Secretary, Admiral Ernest J. King, allowed Kimmel's legal aide, retired Navy Captain Robert A. Lavender, to do so. He "extracted some forty-three messages, messages typical of what he thought should have gone to Kimmel." As he looked at these messages, he "became nauseated," and could not eat that evening while he was informing Kimmel's other attorneys of their contents.[78]

> The following day Marshall's deputy telephoned the director of Naval Communications to vigorously protest Lavender's visit to the secret files. Orders, he said, forbade such an inspection. When the director said he had received no such orders, the deputy hastily explained he merely meant that orders *should* forbid such inspection.
>
> Even though the messages had been segregated and authenticated, the copies were not delivered to Lavender but kept in the custody of Naval Communications . . . .[79]

Marshall also set up two Carter Clarke investigations to scotch growing rumors that he wanted suppressed. Under such interrogation, officers denied they had ever made the statements that others had quoted them as saying about the handling and rumored destruction of "secret" documents. Toland tells us how many of the pertinent documents were finally gotten into the record. This story alone is worth much more than the price of the book.

The next tactic was for the Secretaries of War and the Navy to send "identical bills to the Chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees prohibiting disclosure of any coded matter." With only one hearing "in camera" the bill was rushed through the Senate and sent to the House.[80] If passed into law, it would have destroyed any chance that the American public would ever learn the truth about Pearl Harbor. Toland tells us how this was prevented.

After telling us how the Navy Court of Inquiry and Army Pearl Harbor Board reversed the Roberts Report findings, that made Kimmel and Short the scapegoats, placing a major share of the blame on Marshall and Stark, Toland tells us how these reports were first suppressed. Then, both the Army and Navy set up separate further investigations to discredit the official findings of Admirals and Generals. Prior witnesses were shown the testi-

mony favorable to the cover up and attempts were made to persuade them to change their earlier testimony. Some did, even though one had given his first testimony based on a statement composed by two Marshall aides within a week after Pearl Harbor. Others were persuaded they must have confused a false "winds execute" message with the real one.

There had been a number of private meetings at which witnesses were worked on. One key Navy witness, confined to the psychopathic ward at Bethesda Naval Hospital, was released for a meeting at Stark's home. He changed his original testimony and received a medical discharge right after the Congressional Committee issued its reports. Another Navy officer admitted he changed his "winds execute" testimony "because, up until . . . about 2 months ago, I thought the entire thing in that Wind message was authentic . . . . On talking to some of the officers who had gone into it . . . they said it had been found out later that that was a false broadcast . . . , but it was news to me at that time."[81]

While Toland has made available much valuable material which every informed American should know, the first printing does have a number of errors. Most of them are minor and should be corrected in later printings.

He states that Stimson's persistent hatred and fear of Japan began "while he was Hoover's Secretary of State, with the Japanese conquest of Manchuria in 1932."[82] He should have traced it back to when Stimson was the Governor General of the Philippines from 1927 to 1929. In fact, it was this "hatred and fear" that led him to accept the Secretary of State position in preference to that of the Attorney General, thus leaving that position open for William D. Mitchell, the Congressional Committee's first Counsel, who resigned when he failed to railroad the Committee's Pearl Harbor hearings to an early conclusion.

The book tells us that Marshall's 7 December 1941 secretary, Colonel Walter Bedell Smith, as a Lieutenant General and Eisenhower's Chief of Staff, "flatly denied Colonel Sadtler's claim that he had asked Smith and Gerow on December 5 to authorize him to send Hawaii a warning."[83] Actually, Smith fell back on the standard Marshall-Stark "do not recall" answer. He signed and swore to an affidavit which stated, "I do not recall Colonel Sadtler's coming to me as he has stated." In the same affidavit he swore, "To the best of my recollection . . . . if the intercepted radio message referred to by Colonel Bratton was delivered" to him on the night of 6 December 1941 as Bratton first testified, "it would have been delivered to the Chief of Staff in accordance with our usual procedure." Note how craftily he does not actually deny the testimonies of his fellow officers who remained Colonels throughout the war.

Writing about the "*modus vivendi*" requested by Marshall and Stark, seeking a three months' delay in the breakdown of negotiations with Japan and which had been approved on 25 November by the War Cabinet as well as the British, Dutch and Australian governments, the book states: "Later in the day [the 25th] a cable for Roosevelt arrived from Churchill."[85] Actually this key cable left London at 12:55 a.m., London time, on the 26th and reached Washington at 6 a.m.[86]

Where Toland tells us "the President ordered Stimson to send out 'the final alert,' "[87] Stimson's diary states, "I suggested and he approved." Where the book states that on 28 November "Stimson took the offensive. Strike the Japanese force as it went by—*without warning!*"[88] the diary entry reads:

> It further became a consensus of views that rather than strike at the Force as it went by without any warning . . . the only thing for us to do was to address it a warning that if it reached a certain place, or a certain line, or a certain point, we should have to fight."[89]

The book includes Knox among those who "felt obliged to join in the cover-up and make scapegoats of two innocent men, Kimmel and Short."[90] Actually, Knox died on 28 Aprill 1944, before the Navy Court of Inquiry. Before his death, he did grant Kimmel permission to search the Navy files. It was Marshall and Knox's successor, James Forrestal, who shut that door. Safford told this reviewer that he felt that if Knox had lived, he would have let the truth come out. We shall never know.

Toland tell us how President Harry S. Truman released the reports of the Navy Court of Inquiry and the Army Pearl Harbor Board shortly after V-J Day.[91] He fails to note that these were only the SECRET reports and did not include the TOP SECRET reports which dealt with the testimony concerning the all-important decoded Japanese intercepts the cover-up boys tried so hard to keep secret. These were released some time later after a considerable controversy.

A rather odd change crept into the Toland book between the manuscript and the printed pages. The book has Marshall "vacationing in Florida with his wife" on 27 November 1941, the day that Stimson drafted a key message over Marshall's signature for MacArthur with a duplicate to Short with the added phrase "these measures should be carried out so as not to alarm civil population or disclose intent."[92] This was also the date of the important joint Marshall-Stark memorandum to the President pleading for more time. Available records indicate Marshall left for Army maneuvers on the 26th and was back in his office on the morning of the 28th. If Toland has uncovered new information, it would have been helpful if he had provided the source.

Toland does establish that Kimmel and Short were not the scapegoats the Administration tried to paint them. He also tells of some of the calumny and sleepless nights these men had to suffer as some called them murderers while a number suggested they shoot themselves. The lives of these dedicated, innocent officers were a literal hell on earth for years as they had to suffer in silence. They were great Americans and Kimmel certainly proved himself a great fighter.

There was one real hero in all this infamy. It was my good friend, Laurence Frye Safford. He, too, suffered the torments of hell as he stuck to telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. After all these years, it is good to see a book that presents his story fairly. If it had not been for him, the cover-up boys would have buried the truth where it never could be found. It was he who provided Kimmel with the ammunition to fight. It was he who located and replaced many of the vital intercepts the cover-up boys thought had all been destroyed. It was also he on whom so much shame, ridicule and harrassment was heaped. He sacrificed his own career, but he refused to sacrifice that of Briggs, whose superiors ordered him not to disclose the truth about the "winds execute" message which Toland's INFAMY now reveals.

Toland concludes that "a number of reports to Washington indicated" to Roosevelt that the Japanese carriers were "heading eastward to Hawaii."[93] His evidence is tenuous. For years there were rumors, reports, novels, war games and speculations that Japan would start a war against the United States with a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor or our fleet, wherever it was. These were bandied about in the U. S. Navy as elsewhere. No doubt they continued right up to 7 December 1941. They were so numerous and conjectural that they were unfortunately put aside, though they should not have been, when all the concrete intelligence pointed to a southern Japanese attack force that might, or might not, sail into the Philippines.

The Japanese carriers were under orders to maintain radio silence. They would have been foolish to disobey those orders. Japanese sources have confirmed their silence. Seaman First Class Z and the Lurline radio operators may have heard the "noise" of the brief orders sent the carriers from Japan, but they could not have detected carriers moving in radio silence. There were last minute attempts to alert Washington from both the Netherlands East Indies and Australia. But so far as the record reveals, these all dealt with Japan's southern movements.The Japanese were most secretive about the Pearl Harbor attack plans and had no reason to disclose them to their representatives in Southeast Asia. In any case, there is no hard evidence that any of these reports actually got to the President.

Perhaps some information did. However, all the massive evidence from many, many sources indicates that the attention of FDR and his top advisers was on the Japanese convoys moving south. This long-time student of the Pearl Harbor story has long maintained that there is no need to go beyond established evidence. When one does, it provides an attractive target for the opponents of truth-seeking revisionists. Such speculative claims have hurt the revisionist movement in the past. The treatment given this great book by the WASHINGTON POST is an example of the damage such claims can do. There is a temptation to concentrate on the one questionable claim and thus neglect the many well-documented facts being published in such detail for the first time by such a talented and experienced author.

Washington had plenty of evidence that the United States was going to be attacked. The "winds execute" in conjunction with the Purple and "bomb plot" intercepts and the places where Japanese codes were being destroyed were clear evidence. As to knowledge the attack was to be on Pearl Harbor, this revisionist historian still holds his 1952 position quoted by Prange:

> Percy L. Greaves, Jr., too, conceded, "Washington did not know, or at least no evidence has been adduced that Washington knew, precisely, that the attack would fall on Pearl Harbor although they (sic) had good reason to expect that it might. [94]

Despite his many damning discoveries and disclosures, Toland is timid about blaming FDR, the man at the helm whose policies and decisions, as well as those of his personally-selected aides, led to the Pearl Harbor disaster. He concludes: "There were no heroes or villains on either side. . . . The villain was the times." [95]

Nevertheless, Toland deserves great credit for his efforts. In his pursuit of the truth, he has not been hesitant about changing positions he took in his earlier books. This is the sign of a true scholar. He has made a priceless contribution to the annals of American history. This book should be required reading, not only for every student of government and history, but also for every American who wants to be informed on the shenanigans that cost the loss of so many innocent lives and hid the economic failures of the New Deal policies which are the main cause of our current economic dilemma of inflation, mass unemployment and capital consumption.

Compared with Pearl Harbor, Watergate was a tempest in a teapot. Compared with Prange, Costello and the court historians, Toland is a giant among modern historians.

Infamy: Pearl Harbor and Its Aftermath by John Toland
is available from the Institute for Historical Review, $18.00

Footnotes

Abbreviations	Full Titles
Cong. Hrgs.	*Hearings of Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack*, U.S.Govt. Printing Office, 1945/46.
Costello	*The Pacific War*, by John Costello, Rawson Wade, 1981.
Lash	*Roosevelt and Churchill, 1939-1941*, by Joseph P. Lash, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1976.
Prange	*At Dawn We Slept: The Untold Story of Pearl Harbor*, by Gordon W. Prange, McGraw Hill, 1981.
Perpet. War	*Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*, Harry Elmer Barnes, ed. Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1953. Chapter by Percy L. Greaves, Jr., "The Pearl Harbor Investigations."
Sen. Jud.	*U. S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, The Harry Dexter White Papers*, U.S.Govt. Printing Office, 1956.
Toland	*Infamy*, by John Toland, Doubleday, 1982.
U.S. For. Rel./J.	*United States Foreign Relations, Japan* (1931-1941), U.S.Govt. Printing Office, 1943.
U.S.N. Pro.	*United States Naval Institute, Proceedings*, Annapolis, Md.

Footnote/Source/Page	Footnote/Source/Page
1. Costello, x	23. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 24-2160
2. Prange, ix	24. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 33-1239
3. Prange, xii	25. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 37-846&850
4. Prange, 592	26. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 35-101
5. Prange, 618	27. Prange, xiii
6. Prange, 629	28. Costello, 4
7. Prange, 688	29. Costello, 51
8. Prange, 725	30. Costello, 62
9. Prange, 850	31. Costello, 704 (p.606n)
10. Prange, 839	32. Costello, 646
11. Prange, 839/40	33. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 8-3388
12. Prange, 840	34. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 12-270
13. Prange, 840	35. Costello, 126
14. Prange, 845/46	36. Costello, 68/69
15. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 3-995	37. Costello, 61
16. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 33-1357	38. U.S. For. Rel./J. Vol. 1-479/480
17. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 16-2160/61	39. Costello, 86
18. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 26-264	40. Costello, 87
19. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 26-266	41. Costello, 645 et al
20. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 26-460	42. Costello, 119
21. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 32-70	43. Costello, 124
22. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 5-2102	& Lash, 486

Footnote/Source/Page

44. Toland, 301
45. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 12-165
46. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 10-4662
47. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 14-1411
48. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 14-1328/29
49. Costello, 629
50. Costello, 633
51. Costello, 633/34
52. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 33-732
53. Costello, 634
54. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 26-390
55. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 12-174
56. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 14-1160
57. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 14-1300
58. Sen. Jud. 2733
59. U.S.N. Pro. Dec. 1969-67
60. Costello, 635
61. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 13-415
62. Costello, 635
    & Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 13-425
63. Costello, 630
64. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 16-2014
65. Costello, 49/51 passim
66. Costello, 96
67. Costello, 60/61
68. Costello, 615
69. Costello, 623

Footnote/Source/Page

70. Costello, 625
71. Costello, 94&627
72. Costello, 615/16
73. Costello, 627/28
74. Toland, 320
75. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 3-3829
76. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 35-101
77. Toland, 81
78. Toland, 82
79. Toland, 82
80. Toland, 133/34
81. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 4-2035
82. Toland, 26
83. Toland, 141
84. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 35-91
85. Toland, 267
86. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 14-1300
87. Toland, 274
88. Toland, 277
89. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 11-5436
90. Toland, 323
91. Toland, 145
92. Cong. Hrgs. Vol. 14-1328/29
93. Toland, 316
94. Prange 840
    & Perpet. War, 425
95. Toland, 276

The Faurisson Affair—II

ARTHUR R. BUTZ

MEMOIRE EN DEFENSE, by Robert Faurisson, 275 pp, Preface by Noam Chomsky, La Vieille Taupe; B.P. 9805; 75224 Paris Cedex 05, 1980, FF65.

INTOLERABLE INTOLERANCE, by Jean-Gabriel Cohn-Bendit, Eric Delcroix, Claude Karnoouh, Vincent Monteil, and Jean-Louis Tristani, 206 pp, Editions de la Différence, Paris, 1981, FF42.

This review of the two cited books is a continuation of my account of Robert Faurisson's struggles in France; it is assumed that the reader is acquainted with my review (in vol. 1, no. 4 of this journal) of Serge Thion's *Vérité Historique ou Vérité Politique?*

When I was writing the *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* I encountered the name of a certain Dr. Kremer, a German physician who had been posted to the Auschwitz concentration camp in the summer and fall of 1942, and who had made certain entries in his diary that put Auschwitz in a terrible, even horrible light, e.g. "we are at *anus mundi*." A limited examination of the Kremer matter indicated to me that what he was implicitly referring to, assuming the diary authentic, was the typhus epidemic that devastated the camp at that time (*Hoax*, 58, 125ff). Moreover the leading bearers of the "extermination" legend had not attributed great significance to this diary so I paid little more attention to

Dr. Kremer (this Johann Paul Kremer must not be confused with the Tibère Kremer associated with the Nyiszli book).

When the Faurisson affair erupted in the pages of *Le Monde* in late 1978, therefore, I was surprised to see the opposition, principally Georges Wellers of the Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation in Paris, emphasize in its arguments the supposed implications of the Kremer diary. Some reflection revealed the reasons for this emphasis.

Above all, one must recognize the peculiar status of any true diary as an historical source. It is not written for publication, or even for the eyes of any but the author and perhaps (as is sometimes the case with prominent people involved in events known to be the objects of future scrutiny) a not unfriendly student who has taken the trouble to acquaint himself, as far as possible, with the context in which the diary entries were made. Consequently, diaries are particularly likely sources of sentences lifted out of context if they become involved in heated public controversy. For one thing, such lifting out of context may easily be quite innocent, for the reason that the participants in the controversy are removed from the circumstances in which the diary was authored. What is worse, the observers of the controversy are remote not only from the circumstances of the diary, but typically from the diary itself. Such facts make it especially difficult to set aright, in a manner convincing to the observers, the contextual meanings of disputed passages.

For such reasons Wellers was able to make a certain impact with his comments on the Kremer diary (*Le Monde*, 29 December 1978), while Faurisson, when given an amount of space in *Le Monde*(16 January 1979) typical of an article in a daily newspaper, could not under the circumstances give the diary the exposition that the controversy required.

It is well worth mentioning that Faurisson is a professional and specialist precisely in a discipline most relevant to such tasks; his field is "criticism of texts and documents." Among all those whose views have been prominently aired on any side in the "Holocaust" controversy, Faurisson is to my knowledge the only such specialist.

The reader should not assume that the Weller's misquotes from the Kremer diary were "innocent." We read in his cited article the following alleged quotation from the Kremer diary:

> This morning, at 3 o'clock, I attended a special action for the first time. Compared to that, Dante's Inferno seems a comedy. It is not without reason that Auschwitz is called an extermination camp.

Among many other things Faurisson had to point out that

Wellers had deleted the word "outside" in what should have been "outside at 3'oclock," which would have made the action in question difficult to imagine as a gassing. In addition, there was a recoloring of meaning in the term "extermination camp," which gave the impression that Kremer had written "*Vernichtungslager*," a word which, contrary to the widely held view, did not exist among the Germans during World War II. What Kremer wrote was "*das Lager der Vernichtung*," i.e. the camp of the annihilation, a term that takes on a clear significance only when the diary is understood in context.

Despite the points that Faurisson scored, there were puzzles outstanding in connection with the diary. When Faurisson's litigations arose in 1979 the diary became a point of contention. No longer subject to *Le Monde's* space constraints, Faurisson drew up his superb analysis of the Kremer diary, for use in court, and this analysis constitutes the principal component of *Mémoire en Défense* (in legal context, "*mémoire*" is close in meaning to our "brief"). After many pages of analysis of the diary (which says nothing of gassings) Faurisson shows that the horrors Kremer was referring to were indeed essentially those produced by the typhus epidemic, and that if there had been gassings then Kremer would have explicitly written so in the diary, as Kremer was sufficiently sure of privacy to commit several anti-Nazi remarks to his diary (that Kremer testified in support of the propagandists' interpretation of his own diary, before a postwar German court commited *a priori* to that interpretation, scarcely requires explanation here).

Faurisson turns in his usual concise but thorough performance in this book and the only comment I might make on it, that may seem negative, is that the matters treated are nearly the ultimate in esoterica and are likely to interest only active investigators in this historical area (apart from those of Faurisson's enemies who sniff all over his writings looking for things that might be somehow used against him).

The extraordinarily intense nature of Faurisson's contributions to this volume stand in contrast to the routine, indeed "banal," nature of the preface. However, since this preface was authored by Noam Chomsky, the famous M.I.T. linguist, it was the feature that brought even international publicity to the book (e.g. *N.Y. Times*, 1 January 1981).

It will be recalled that in 1979 Chomsky signed a petition in support of Faurisson's right to research the "Holocaust" subject and to publish his conclusions (the statement is reproduced in Thion's book).

In the U.S. journal *Nation* (28 February 1981) Chomsky explained the circumstances which led to the appearance of his preface in

the book. Thion had later asked Chomsky to make a more elaborate statement in support of Faurisson's rights as a scholar. Chomsky complied, telling Thion "to use it as he wished." Thion chose to offer it to Pierre Guillaume, Faurisson's publisher, for inclusion in the book. Chomsky was later persuaded by a French correspondent that "in France . . . (Chomsky's) defense of Faurisson's right to express his views would be interpreted as support for them," and so he attempted to stop the appearance of his statement in the book, but it was too late.

The gist of Chomsky's preface is that the right of free expression should not be limited to those ideas of which one approves and, of course, it is precisely in the defense of the right to express socially unpopular ideas that any principle of free expression draws its vitality. It is not unusual for professors to expound thus; they do so very often. What is unusual is that a professor, and a very prominent one at that, should feel obliged to direct such remarks to "intellectuals" rather than college freshmen. Chomsky saw the irony of the situation at the very outset of his essay by declaring that the "remarks that follow are so banal that I think I must ask reasonable people . . . to excuse me."

The Chomsky preface is almost entirely focused on the issues of academic freedom and civil liberties that are involved in the Faurisson affair. He strays slightly away from such concerns in expressing his opinion that Faurisson is a "relatively apolitical liberal," but nowhere does he endorse any of Faurisson's theses pertaining to "exterminations" and "gas chambers." In the ensuing controversy Chomsky went further and vigorously subscribed to the received "Holocaust" legend. For example, he had lively and even acrimonious encounters with Gitta Sereny in the British *New Statesman* (17 July, 14 August & 11 September 1981) and with W.D. Rubinstein in the Australian *Quadrant* (October 1981 & April 1982).

Sereny and Rubinstein, whatever their protests to the contrary, placed themselves squarely on the sides of both officially enforced censorship and informally enforced ignorance (in 1979 Rubinstein was writing letters to Australian libraries urging them not to make my book available). Chomsky, by contrast, placed himself almost as squarely on the side of the "free market in ideas." I am not forgetting that when I remark, as I must, that Sereny and Rubinstein, despite the poverty of their thought and the hypocrisy of their arguments, scored some points in these encounters that should be noted. For one thing, Chomsky's last minute attempt to withdraw the permission he had given Thion leaves a bad taste. He is not ten years old. As Sereny remarked, "Surely Mr. Chomsky is not telling us that when he . . . consented to write this opinion . . . that it didn't occur to him that Serge Thion— who has written a whole book upholding Faurisson's arguments, pub-

lished by Pierre Guillaume—would use a document of such publicity value for M. Faurisson's benefit?"

For another and far more serious thing Rubinstein, following Nadine Fresco (*Dissent*, Fall 1981), takes Chomsky to task for the apparent contradiction between his libertarian position regarding Faurisson and his decade earlier (*Social Policy*, May/June 1972) position regarding Harvard psychologist Richard Herrnstein's article "I.Q." (*Atlantic*, September 1971). In the latter part of an otherwise carefully reasoned critique of Herrnstein, Chomsky lost his bearings, if not his marbles:

> . . . the question of the validity and scientific status of a particular point of view is, of course, logically independent from the question of its social function; each is a legitimate topic of inquiry, and the latter becomes of particular interest when the point of view in question is revealed to be seriously deficient on empirical or logical grounds.
>
> . . . (The scientist) is responsible for the effects of what he does, insofar as they can be clearly forseen. If the likely consequences of his "scientific work" (can be used as a justification for class and caste hierarchies), he has the responsibility to take this likelihood into account. This would be true even if the work had real scientific merit—more so, in fact, in this case.
>
> Similarly imagine a psychologist in Hitler's Germany who thought he could show that Jews had a genetically determined tendency toward usury . . . or a drive toward antisocial conspiracy and domination, and so on. If he were criticized for even undertaking these studies, could he merely respond that "a neutral commentator . . . would have to say that the case is simply not settled" and that the "fundamental issue" is "whether inquiry shall (again) be shut off because someone thinks society is best left in ignorance?" I think not. Rather I think that such a response would have been met with justifiable contempt. At best he could claim that he is faced with a conflict of values. On the one hand, there is the alleged scientific importance of determining whether, in fact, Jews have a genetically determined tendency toward usury and domination (as might conceivably be the case). On the other, there is the likelihood that even opening this question and reguarding it as a subject for scientific inquiry would provide ammunition for Goebbels and Rosenberg and their henchmen. Were this hypothetical psychologist to disreguard the likely social consequences of his research (or even his undertaking of research) under existing social conditions, he would fully deserve the contempt of decent people. Of course, scientific curiosity should be encouraged (though fallacious argument and investigation of silly questions should not), but it is not an absolute value.

Chomsky is not specific either on the method by which his hypothetical scientists can "take . . . into account" the social consequences of their work or on what should happen to them if they don't, apart from his vague reference to "contempt." After a rea-

sonably close examination of his article I can think of no other method to accomplish the former, in a manner seemingly acceptable to Chomsky, but to not publish the work, "even if the work had real scientific merit." As for the latter, it is difficult to believe that as a practical matter the penalty for the unwelcome "curiosity" would stop at "contempt" if Chomsky's principle is accepted. If Chomsky rejects such interpretations of his writings, he nevertheless must take responsibility for advancing a theory which would naturally be understood thus. As proof witness Rubinstein, who wants to hold Chomsky to such interpretations regarding Faurisson, on the grounds that Faurisson's theories have, to Rubinstein's mind, socially undesirable implications.

It should not be necessary to take the space here to describe the shambles, or perhaps madhouse, that scholarship becomes if the scholar must answer to influential colleagues regarding the supposed "social function" of his conclusions or even questions. I suspect that Chomsky, especially in the aftermath of his involvement in the Faurisson affair, would mitigate or, better, repudiate his earlier position. Among the many points that could be made to Chomsky is one that he, with his respect for strict logic, would have to concede. Namely, the statement that certain investigations should not be undertaken because they might benefit the racists (or communists, or Republicans, or vegetarians), is itself a statement that could be used for the benefit of racists (or communists, Republicans, or vegetarians). It can even be used rather more effectively, for propaganda purposes, than "work . . . of real scientific merit," since it relieves the racist (communist, Republican, vegetarian) of the need to prove anything, when he can validly argue that the scientists are intentionally stacking the deck against his side.

It was earlier noted that Faurisson has had a group of French supporters, more or less leftist, almost from the beginning of his "affair." Some of them wrote articles attempting to explain the nature and degree of their support, and what further thoughts have come to them as a result. All of course support his right to research the subject and publish his revisionist conclusions, but all also state concurrence with his theses only to degrees. These articles were put together by Pierre Guillaume, not in his capacity as owner of the publishing house La Vieille Taupe, but as editor of the series "Le Puits et le Pendule" (whose members have been published both by Editions de la Différence and by the larger house J.E. Hallier/Albin Michel), and published as a book under the title *Intolérable Intolérance*.

Readers acquainted with recent history and controversies will, with only one exception, find that these essays deal with generally familiar matters. The exception is the contribution of lawyer Eric Delcroix, which requires some acquaintance with the French legal system.

Cohn-Bendit, self described "Jew of the extreme left," seems most astonished at his present position, as he used to use, against the revisionists, "all the responses that are made to (him) today." Worse, today he is strange bedfellow to "people of the right, even fascist types . . . and this situation is to (him) *insupportable.*" However he holds up under the pressure and realizes past sins: "I helped myself to democratic principles for *my* right of expression and found all sorts of good arguments to justify the prohibition of other ideas." In the Faurisson affair he has seen particularly impressive demonstrations of the fact that formal prohibition is not the only form of effective censorship, and that there is also the form that buries issues by declining to meet them directly and instead attacks the supposed motivations and consequences associated with a given thesis. Despite all this, he still considers himself "a convinced '*exterminationist*'," but not a believer in the gas chambers; he compares Hitler's anti-Jewish policy to past Indian policies in the U.S.A., Armenian policies in Turkey, and Tatar policies of Stalin.

I should remark, parenthetically, that the word "exterminationist" means, in this context, "one who believes in the extermination of the Jews at the hands of the Germans during WW II." Sometimes it more narrowly designates a prominent promoter of the extermination legend, e.g. Hilberg, Dawidowicz, Wiesenthal, or Poliakov. It is a strange term, but it seems to have caught on.

Monteil's essay is a refutation of the judgment against Faurisson of 8 July 1981 (translations of passages from some of these judgments appeared in *Patterns of Prejudice*, October 1981). The court, after recognizing that it has "neither the quality nor the competence to judge history (and has) not been charged by law with a mission to decide how this or that episode of national or world history must be represented," proceeded to do just that, e.g. "Faurisson has fixed his attention, in an almost exclusive fashion, on one of the means of extermination of which the reality has been established since the end of WW II and the discovery of the concentration camp system." Monteil raises more or less routine points against such doublethink and then indicates imminent agreement with Faurisson:

> Until 1978 I believed in the general existence (or pretty much so) of the gas chambers in the camps, while having reservations on the unverifiable and surely excessive number of Jewish victims of the "Holocaust." It suffices to cite my book (unlocatable, by reason of the obstruction of the "Hachette octopus" which "strangled" Guy Authier, my publisher)— *Dossier secret sur Israel: le terrorisme* (Paris, March 1978)—to see what my position was then. But since then I have read and met Robert Faurisson: his earnestness and his good faith have convinced me, even if certain judgments appear disputable to me, that it is justifiably urgent to discuss them calmly, in place of heaping onto an honest and courageous investigator the anathema reserved to heretics!

Tristani, a social scienist at the Sorbonne, with degrees in theology and philosophy, finds a striking religious character in the whole affair. Such an idea should not be new to a student of this subject. Indeed, I have discussed (*Hoax*, 188f) the remarkable parallels between the "war crimes trials" and the witchcraft trials of centuries ago, and found those parallels far more convincing than parallels that could be drawn between the war crimes trials and earlier narrowly politically motivated trials. However Tristani's point of departure is different:

> The Holocaust, which represents one of the most popular themes of contemporary Judaism, thus falls into a long tradition. It is bound up with what it would be necessary to call the "invention of Israel," of the Israel of today. The Hitlerian genocide perpetrated in the gas chambers, the Exodus and the creation of the Israeli state, do they not attain in effect the lofty meaning which the servitude in Egypt, the Exodus, and the installation in the Promised Land once had?

Tristani finds fault with the revisionists for apparently ignoring such matters:

> Would not the "frivolity" reproached to Faurisson consist rather in having underestimated the importance of this religious function which the accounts of the gas chambers and the genocide have acquired? Moreover the same question holds for Serge Thion because, from the anthropological point of view where it becomes indispensable to place oneself to understand this affair, the primary alternative is not between historical truth and political truth but between historical and religious truth.

To this I must comment that such a criticism of Faurisson holds at best only in relation to his published writings. He and I have long been generally aware of the relationships that Tristani calls attention to. We discussed the matter at length in 1980 when he was in the U.S.A. His attitude on the subject was far from frivolous, as he saw this secularized religious hysteria as bringing the whole world down on him. I can say that my failure, and perhaps also Faurisson's failure, to expound publicly on such matters is based on certain personal limitations, self or otherwise imposed, on the sorts of things considered manageable in terms of investigation and public discourse. I am happy to see that there are now authors, such as Tristani, who wish to tread this ground, as it is as interesting as it is treacherous, and I look forward to further developments.

The longest and, I would say, most representative essay in this book is Karnoouh's. Its major function is to interpret the "Holocaust" controversy from a point of view that is both leftist and friendly to Faurisson. Following the strange leftist practice of describing the millenial assertive, repressive and exploitive strivings of states as somehow partaking especially of the spirit of the

recent, short lived and relatively benign (in comparison to its contemporaries) Mussolini movement, Karnoouh finds that

> present day fascism has taken other faces, under the American tutelage; it has invaded the Third World (as witness) Somoza's Nicaragua, Stroesner's Paraguay, Argentina, Chile, El Salvador, Indonesia . . . western Europe no longer needs concentration camps on its territories; it has displaced them elsewhere, where the reproduction of capital is facilitated with the aid of slave labor . . . and Israel hardly deprives itself of this facility . . . .

For Karnoouh Israel fits into such a world very comfortably since "Zionism is also a national and socialist European ideology," i.e. it was developed in Europe contemporaneously with the other nationalist, socialist and racist ideologies that we are acquainted with by direct experience, and it grew to political consequence in the same epoch. Thus

> The slow and irresistible displacement of Israel towards the American camp is also quite comprehensible if account is taken of the power . . . of the American Jewish community. And, without wishing to establish too simplistic a comparison, it is not insignificant (that) the Jewish state seems to play the role of custodian watching over the Mideast for the sake of American Imperialism.

Now the visibility of such relationships could put Israel and the Diaspora Jews into a defensive position perilous enough to cause the latter to entertain serious questions on the wisdom of supporting the Zionist enterprise. In Karnoouh's view, the "Holocaust" provides the necessary binding:

> . . . The nation-state has always had need of these simplified representations of history . . . in order to turn popular and collective emotions to its profit.
>
> Only a religious or mythical version of the deportation and massacre of the Jews, the "Holocaust," can assume this role because it simplifies history and transforms the contradictions and quite complex political, ideolgical and economic conflicts into a Manichean saga which expresses the eternal struggle between Good and Evil, the "Goy" and the Jew, the German and the Jew, the Arab and the Jew.

This sort of formulation must be expected from a leftist source but, in any case, there is much truth in it. Among the many reservations I have, it is worthwhile to mention two particularly important ones. First, Israel does not represent or guard American interests in the Mideast. The relationship is the reverse and to the American disadvantage. For another thing, I believe it is misleading to view the basic role of the "Holocaust" propaganda in terms of its effect on Jews. While the propaganda doubtless has the unifying effect among Jews that Karnoouh notes, it is paraded loudly and massively before predominantly gentile audiences, and its

function should be considered in this light. Indeed the especially massive propaganda of approximately the past five years is not a response to any weakening of links between Israel and the Diaspora. If I may risk a charge of immodesty, it seems to me that it is a response to the revisionists.

Karnoouh seems to get some things backward when they relate directly to Jews, and that brings us to the secondary role of his essay. Karnoouh is of Jewish ancestry, but does not consider himself Jewish. However even that view, when expressed in his writing, reveals the existence of a "Jewish question."

> Can I today define myself in all sincerity as a Jew? Delicate question, (and to) the defense lawyer who asked it I answered: "For the anti-semites and racists, I am a Jew, for other men I am simply a man who belongs to the French culture." This affirmation earned me the hatred of not only the xenophobic spectators but also that of certain of my friends, among the most tolerant, who considered the sentiment a betrayal on my part. In a few seconds, I had become a renegade who abandoned his own in the moment of "the danger." But does one have the right to associate me with an identity which does not relate to my experience and which, consequently, is more or less exterior to my consciousness?

This view is both refreshingly rational and disturbingly paradoxical for, after all, Karnoouh has now given us a long and carefully considered essay in which his Jewish background is certainly not "exterior to (his) consciousness." How does one resolve the apparent cohabitation of reason and paradox in Karnoouh's views? If there is a way, many would be very interested to learn it, for we are here confronted not with a mere transient "problem" but with the quite subsistent and indeed robust "Jewish question." This cannot be a revelation to Pierre Guillaume and Editions de la Différence for they have issued, almost simultaneously, a new printing of Bernard Lazare's 1894 classic, *L'Antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes.*

In summary, *Intolérable Intolérance* is an uneven book. It ranges from the trite, through the engaging, to the provocative. It is nevertheless a very important book, despite or even because of the nature of its shortcomings, and we must thank the authors and publishers for making it available. Its importance derives not only from new insights that it offers, but also from its posing of challenging questions in an area of social relations in which thought has been in a state of suspension and controversy in a state of evasion for several decades at least. As its points of departure are not esoteric historical questions but current controversies, it is just the sort of book that can set into operation critical faculties that have been accumulating dust and even rust in this period of "suspension" of thought. It is hoped that an English translation will appear.

I should add a note on the availability, to the U.S. reader, of the books reviewed here. *Intolérable Intolérance* can be obtained through any established dealer in foreign books, via his special order. *Mémoire en Défense*, however, should be ordered directly from La Vieille Taupe in Paris. That is also the case for Thion's *Vérité Historique ou Vérité Politique?*, as the distributor mentioned in my earlier review of that book is no longer handling it.

I close with a partial report on Faurisson's litigations. The most serious dangers that his enemies raised for him were based on a statement he made in an interview on French TV on 17 December 1980:

> The historical lie has permitted a gigantic political-financial swindle, whose principal beneficiaries are the state of Israel and international Zionism, and whose principal victims are the German people, but not their leaders, and the whole of the Palestinian people.

For this he was charged with defamation of the Jewish people (group libel) and incitement to racial hatred. Found guilty of both, he was ordered to pay damages and fines totalling 21,000 francs, given a three month prison sentence (suspended) and, most important, ordered to pay for the reproduction of the judgment in four publications and over national TV (*Le Monde*, 5-6 July 1981). The last requirement involved a sum of about half a million dollars and was well beyond his means. The situation looked particularly ominous as there is no law of personal bankruptcy in France (only a business can go bankrupt there).

His appeal against this ruling, announced 23 June 1982, brought success for him on this most grave part of the judgment, and his conviction for incitement to racial hatred was overturned. However the charge of defamation of the Jewish people was sustained, as were the fines, damages, and suspended prison sentence (*Le Monde*, 26 June 1982).

Faurisson's supporters breathed a sigh of relief over the important successful part of the appeal outcome. That which has been left standing is nevertheless a moral and intellectual outrage. In an age in which virtually all sectors of public opinion have proclaimed their devotion to "freedom" with the persistence of an absent minded devout who has lost count of his Hail Marys, a professor is being punished for announcing the politically unpopular conclusions of his research. This observation would hold even if Faurisson had been victorious in the first instances in all his trials. The professional and international yappers for "freedom", whom we hear so often, have with only scattered and isolated exceptions either pretended that they never heard of Faurisson, or found rationalizations to excuse his persecution. This fact is almost not worth mentioning, because the hypocrisy referred to is all too familiar.

Faurisson's trials are not concluded.

About the Contributors

JAMES J. MARTIN graduated from the University of Michigan in 1942 and received his MA (1945) and Ph.D (1949) degrees in History from the University of Michigan. His teaching career has spanned twenty-five years and involved residence at educational institutions from coast to coast. Dr. Martin has contributed some of the outstanding books of revisionism related to the Second World War: the two-volume classic *American Liberalism and World Politics, 1931-1941*, and the collected essays *Revisionist Viewpoints* and *The Saga of Hog Island and Other Essays in Inconvenient History*. He is a three-time contributor to the *Dictionary of American Biography* and has as well contributed to recent editions of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

ISSAH NAKHLEH is a Palestinian. He is a graduate of London University (LL.B), and was Barrister-at-Law of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, London. He has practiced as an attorney in Palestine, and served as the representative of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine at the Sessions of the United Nations in 1947-1948. At present he is the representative of the Arab Higher Committee and Permament Representative of the Palestine-Arab Delegation in New York.

PERCY L. GREAVES, Jr. is the former chief of the minority research staff of the 1945-1946 Joint Congressional Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack. He is probably more qualified to speak with authority on Pearl Harbor than any man alive, and indeed has spoken and written prodigiously on the subject, including a chapter, "The Pearl Harbor Investigations," for the classic book edited by Harry Elmer Barnes (and soon to be re-published by the IHR), *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*. Mr. Greaves is additionally a free market economist of note. He has served as financial editor and research economist for *U.S. News and World Report* in Washington, D.C., as Armstrong Professor of Economics with Professor Ludwig von Mises at the University of Plano, Texas, and as a seminar speaker and discussion leader with the Foundation for Economic Education in New York.

ARTHUR R. BUTZ was born and raised in New York City. He received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and his Ph.D. in Control Sciences from the University of Minnesota in 1965. In 1966 he joined the faculty at Northwestern University where he is now Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computor Sciences. Dr. Butz is the author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, the most thorough revisionist work on the Holocaust to date.

MARK WEBER was born and raised in Oregon and received his higher education at universities around the world: Portland State University (BA, History, with high honors, 1976), the University of Illinois, the University of Munich, and Indiana State University (MA, Central European History, with high honors, 1977). He currently works in Washington, D.C. as a freelance researcher, author and German translator.

THOMAS HENRY IRWIN, 28, is pursuing a law degree at the University of Kentucky College of Law. Prior to this, he was a Graduate Teaching Associate at Ohio State University. He received his undergraduate degree from Western Kentucky University. He has written a scholarly paper examining the rhetoric of Tom Watson's later career.